ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/3/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED000674
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 8118
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.:

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Planning and Maintaining Programs for the Superior Student

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Proceedings of the Southern Univ. Invitational Conference

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Southern Univ. and Agricultural and Mechanical College
ST.
CITY, STATE Baton Rouge, La.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
47	1-120	Jan. 61	120

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

conferneces	higher edu.	honors programs.		
talent	cultural factors	motivation		
students	racial factors	development (?)		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Proceedings of a conference sponsored by Southern University in cooperation with the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student. A major motivating force leading to the creation of the conference was the belief that a significant number of potentially talented Negro students are not discovered because of certain deterring cultural factors. Papers reported in the Proceedings are centered around discussions of honors programs and the identification, motivation, and development of talented students among the culturally deprived.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT: Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

Reporter 6-14
X-4, 21, 23 R

Clearinghouse copy

8118

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

BULLETIN

8118

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

PROCEEDINGS

Southern University Invitational Conference

IN COOPERATION WITH THE INTER-UNIVERSITY
COMMITTEE ON THE SUPERIOR STUDENT
FOR
PLANNING AND MAINTAINING PROGRAMS
FOR THE SUPERIOR STUDENT

Baton Rouge Louisiana

Volume 47 January 1961 Number 4

ED000674

FELTON G. CLARK

PRESIDENT
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
AND A. AND M. COLLEGE

BATON ROUGE
LOUISIANA

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Volume 47 January 1961 Number 4

Bulletin

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
and
Agricultural and Mechanical College

William Couch, Jr., Editor

PROCEEDINGS

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE

IN COOPERATION WITH THE INTER-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE SUPERIOR STUDENT FOR PLANNING AND MAINTAINING PROGRAMS FOR THE SUPERIOR STUDENT

Baton Rouge Louisiana

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 17, 1944, at the United States Post Office, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Elton C. Harrison
Background of the Conference 5

Joseph W. Cohen
Honors Programs Today—Trends and Problems 7

William A. Banner
Why Honors Programs? 16

Vivian J. Tellis
Desirable Characteristics of Honors Programs 19

Cecil G. Taylor
Organizing and Administering Honors Programs 24

John Hicks
Teaching Superior Students through Honors Programs 28

William H. Robinson
High School Relations and College Honors 35

John Hope Franklin
To Educate All the Jeffersonians 40

Horace Mann Bond
The Influence of Cultural Factors on Academic Performance 50

Bruce Shertzer
Identifying and Motivating the Talented Among the Culturally Deprived 71

Huel D. Perkins
The Role of the Teacher in Developing the Talented of the Culturally Deprived 76

Lynette Saine
The Role of Reading in Identifying and Developing the Talented 82

Willie C. Davis
The Role of Remedial Programs in Developing the Talented of the Culturally Deprived 89

Daniel Schreiber
An Academic Talent Search Among the Less Privileged Groups 95

Albert N. Whiting
Next Steps in Identifying and Encouraging Talented Negro Youth 110

Appendix:
- *Resource Persons* 118
- *College Representatives* 119
- *Conference Planning Committee* 120
- *Conference Advisors* 120

BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

On February 22-24, 1960, Southern University, in cooperation with the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, sponsored a regional conference on PLANNING AND MAINTAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUPERIOR STUDENTS. The University's interest in the conference was influenced by the growing national concern for the identification and encouragement of the talented in view of the emergence of trained intelligence as a key factor in the current international involvements.

Serving as an additional motivating force was the belief that existing among Negro youth is a significant number of potentially talented Negro students who, because of certain deterring cultural factors, are not discovered. Moreover, of those who are discovered few have the opportunity to benefit from the kind of educational experience that would enable them to realize their potential. Although considerable progress is being made toward the development of superior students, there has been a noticeable lack of interest as regards Negro students.

Convinced of the need for programs at the college level geared to the development of the talented among Negro youth, President Felton G. Clark appointed a faculty committee to formulate plans for a regional conference that would have as its central concern the identification and encouragement of the potentially talented with emphasis on compensating for some deterring cultural factors. Thirty-nine representatives of twenty-eight colleges primarily for Negroes were invited to participate in the conference.

Southern University is most appreciative of the guidance and financial assistance received from ICSS through Director Joseph W. Cohen and Associate Director N. D. Kurland and of the financial contributions received from the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and from the Southern Education Foundation Fund. The institution wishes to acknowledge, too, the following persons who, among others mentioned elsewhere, made valuable contributions to the success of the conference:

John Codwell, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
R. L. Cousins, Assistant Director, Southern Education Foundation
John Hicks, Executive Director, College English Association
Benjamin Hunton, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools, Washington, D. C.
L. L. Kilgore, Director, Negro Education, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Roger P. McCutcheon, Consultant, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation
Cecil Taylor, Dean, College of the Arts and Sciences, Louisiana State University

[signed] Elton C. Harrison
Dean of Instruction

HONORS PROGRAMS TODAY—TRENDS AND PROBLEMS*

JOSEPH W. COHEN
Director of the Inter-University Committee
on the Superior Student

Honors Programs in the past have dealt with survivors of two or three years of tragic neglect. They were usually conceived as programs in the major department and started in the junior or senior year. They were chiefly programs of independent study. It was all too little, too late, too esoteric and too invisible to the rest of the student body. At most institutions a mere handful of such Honors students existed. In short, we practically ignored the more able until in their final years they literally forced themselves upon our attention. We lumped them with all the rest and designed most of our courses for the undifferentiated mass of students. We assumed that the good students took care of themselves, or that it was a violation of the democratic principles of the campus to seek them out, or both; and each of these assumptions is fallacious. But we made a final gesture that eased any troubled academic consciences: we gave Honors on high grade point averages—a job admirably performed by the IBC machines. We also gave these high averages Phi Beta Kappa keys and sent them out to dangle them from their vests. The keys were no guarantee that the doors of the kingdom of learning would remain open. In the meantime we multiplied the non-academic activities, fraternity and sorority shenanigans, made them glamorous and identified campus spirit with them. We worked up an "Honors Program" for athletes, punctiliously sought them out from their earliest show of talent in high school, gave them scholarships and built them into college and public heroes. I have just seen a parking area on the campus of a state university marked "Scholarship Parking". I asked what was meant by this and was told that it was for those alumni coming to the games who had provided such scholarships for football prospects.

---

*Address delivered at the Thirteenth Annual Conference on Higher Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, November 18, 1959.

Nine times as much time and money has been spent, according to one researcher in the field, on remedial work for inferior students as on special attention to the superior. How many of the talented have been lost through boredom and frustration? How many settled early for the sole reward of the high grades they so easily made and abandoned further ambition to pursue excellence? We shall never know. With minor exceptions these have been the main trends in Honors for the immediate past.

What then of the present? It is quite a different story. The primary emphasis now is upon the pursuit of excellence, not upon the pursuit of grades as such. Today programs for the gifted aim first of all to detect them as early as possible and to generate in them an Honors outlook in all studies leading to the degree through all four years. This means clearly starting with the freshman year. Freshmen are identified by various available and improving techniques involving maximum cooperation with high schools, entrance and other scholastic aptitude and achievement tests, interviews and subsequent faculty experience and knowledge. It means taking advantage of advanced placement and acceleration and the inauguration of other Honors relations with high school staffs and students, new types of high school visitation and more academically significant educational contacts between subject-matter professors in higher education and secondary school teachers. One trend here is that of admitting high school seniors to some college classes for three to eight hours of credit, as is done with the University of California and elsewhere. This facilitates new relations with secondary schools. Honors freshmen at Louisiana State University have told me recently that they should know about the Honors programs in college at the latest by their junior year in high school. This trend toward beginning Honors on entrance is immeasurably aided today by the many parallel developments in programs for the gifted in secondary education. They promise to go more than halfway in solving the problem of liaison for the colleges and they promise also a new alertness in good high school seniors. They will be expecting to find an Honors program in the college of their choice.

In keeping with all of this, a second trend today is to inaugurate ability sections in multiple-section, lower division courses and to establish special courses, freshmen and sophomore colloquia, Honors theme groups or seminars and independent study for credit, particularly for the summer vacations. These varied types of offerings continue to be made available for upperclassmen as well even after they begin Honors work in their major field. All departments are invited to work out special courses for Honors non-majors who are juniors and seniors. Special inter-disciplinary area, divisional and even interdivisional courses, seminars and colloquia are emerging. This approach covering all four years, is therefore the foundation of a trend towards Honors in general studies or "college Honors."

The central purpose of college Honors is what has been called "Engagement and Liberation" of the good mind in all that marks the educated layman in the two large areas outside the area of concentration. The Honors major in the humanities, for example, should achieve a certain minimum *Honors* involvement in the culture of science and technology on the one hand, and in the understanding of the historical ad contemporary foundations of social and institutional life. The students will inevitable ask the faculty specific questions about the aims of general Honors; they will want guidance at the vraious stages of their educational development and the Honors faculty's task will be to provide it for them as the program develops through the four years. Honors counselling must indeed be richly cognizant of the full implications of this perspective.

Now what of departmental Honors? Each department sets up a visible Honors program for its own Honors majors.

The special ability sections of the lower division themselves can naturally be, in part at least, the first phase of such departmental Honors programs. Each department will have its own Honors chairman or committee. It will make sure that its Honors program and the kinds of outcome expected from it will be available to all students in printed form. The college Honors Administration will inform each department chairman of the incoming Honors freshmen or sophomores who have already designated their field of concentration prior to majoring. Sometimes two or more cognate departments will work out a joint Honors program. We have instances in some colleges of a single department, impatient over delay in the inauguration of a college program, taking the initiative itself with great success, with a resulting steep increase in the number of its majors. This has happened to my knowledge in different universities in mathematics, physics, psychology, chemistry, political science and English. There must be many other examples of it. Where a department is of itself too small to provide an adequate number of Honors majors for special junior or senior courses, an appropriate grouping of departments and a divisional approach are often found effective as is the case in the social sciences at the University of Colorado. The Special Programs at Princeton, the Directed Studies at Yale; certain American Studies programs as at the University of California and the University of Wyoming—these provide other possible variations in interdisciplinary area Honors programs. A divisional organization for Honors accompanies the Swarthmore program. Characteristic of departmental programs are the senior thesis and the final comprehensive written and oral examinations with a faculty man from another department invited to participate, sometimes, as at Swarthmore and Rochester, with outside examiners.

The two sides of the full program—general and departmental Honors—are seen as of equal importance. They fortify each other. The general program in its lower division phase furnishes better motivated majors to the departments. The juniors and seniors now majoring, on the other hand, seek a continuation of the broader perspectives of the general Honors program in their last two years. The Honors council or Honors committee is set up in such a fashion as to be representative of the major aspects of the program, both general and departmental.

A trend also seems to be emerging as a result of more cumulative experience with acceleration as at Harvard or the University of Kansas or Bowling Green University for Honors seniors to be beginning some graduate level courses in their final semesters. Although this will raise questions of possible conflict between enrichment and acceleration, it will further fortify the already notable power of Honors programs to direct the gifted into academic and research careers.

General or college Honors and departmental Honors are then the two sides of Honors programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. I must now refer to a third important approach—that of the all-University Honors program. This has emerged in institutions like Michigan State University, the University of Illinois, the University of Oregon and Oregon State. It is imminent elsewhere as at Purdue, the University of Washington, Washington State University and the University of New Mexico. It involves the establishment of Honors programs in professional schools like engineering, business administration, education, medicine, journalism, home economics. It raises problems of working out appropriate relations with the College of Liberal Arts, particularly when the first year or two there includes students who will move on into professional curricula or are already in them like premeds and, often, education majors. The problems vary according to the strength or weakness of each of these schools relative to each other and to the liberal arts. But the main challenge in all-university Honors is to effect a much higher level of professional achievement; to overcome the cleavages between the humanistic and the scientific, the technological and professional, like the one which, for example, C. P. Snow has very recently so vividly brought to our attention in his now famous article on "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution". A no less important aspect of this is the greater relevance of advanced placement and acceleration in high school and early college years to the kinds of professional training that are of an exceptionally protracted nature. But above all, the all-university Honors program looks toward the modernization and enrichment of professional curricula. Notable beginnings can be cited. The University of Illinois is setting up Honors councils in each major school on the campus. Each has representation on an all-university Honors council. There is much more to be said about the kinds of programs contemplated in each of the different professional schools, quite apart from liaison with each other.

I have presented the three types of programs: general Honors, departmental Honors and all-University Honors. I must now turn to the problems of content and method which are shared by all types of Honors work. There is a broad agreement in this contemporary movement in Honors to stress a preferred approach both as to method and content in the whole range of special Honors offerings. Honors students are brought together in small groups or classes of from five to twenty students. They are confronted with each other. They fire each other up. They emulate each other's excellences rather than merely compete with each other for grades. Each in fact competes with himself to measure up to the quality of the group as a whole and to the requisitions of the subject matter.

Honor study and readings are as far as possible in primary sources, in original documents, rather than in textbooks. The students are not subjected to a steady diet of lectures and pre-digested material from the faculty to be accompanied by their own passive note-taking and subsequent regurgitation on examinations. The professor directs a living, open discussion of ideas. He takes a selective approach to the subject matter to be covered rather than follow a driving compulsion to cover standardized versions of conventional content for this or that course. This is supplemented with independent study, research and summer projects. It is to be noted that there are far more independent projects in such Honors programs than in the traditional type of program which relied solely on independent study in the senior year.

Honors counselling of course is a continuous accompaniment of all Honors work and it is done for the most part by selected subject-matter professors, not by full-time non-teaching counsellors. The fifty-fourth annual report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, just out, lays special emphasis on this point in its survey, "Education of the Academically Talented". It is in the general Honors phase of the program that this becomes of crucial importance; the departmental counselling will naturally be by members of the department. Terminal examinations, sometimes preceded at an earlier stage by qualifying examinations, are worked out to test the Honors outcome toward which the student has all along been preparing.

Superior students require superior teachers, teachers who identify themselves with the full horizons of their fields and with the total human condition; who are operating at the cutting edge of culture; who can break from traditional lecture patterns and who can respond to the amazing vitalities and competencies of the brighter minds of the rising generation. We must bear in mind that there are many teachers, as there are many students, who never find themselves in situations where excellence is demanded of them. The Honors method is bound to change this and it will itself help build the good teachers that are needed. Moreover, it is quite obvious that every faculty has its notable scholar-teachers on whom one must rely for the first phase of inauguration of Honors programs.

Closely related to the problems of finding and building the staff for Honors is the problem of finding the means of budgeting an Honors program. Unless it be properly budgeted, it cannot be properly institutionalized, made an established and permanent feature of the curriculum, and this is indispensable. Programs of the sort we are discussing cannot be left to depend on the incidence of dedicated individuals on the faculty who will ignore the strain of unrequited effort for the sake of the Honors cause. Programs cannot be imposed as an added load to the frequently over-burdened faculty. Honors teaching must be counted on the teaching load. Apart from the time of the director of the program and the cost of his office, the chief budget item for Honors will be instructional. It is wrong, however, to assume that Honors budgets will be excessive. Honors is mistakenly interpreted as a costly addendum to the curriculum. Special ability sections of multiple section courses add little or nothing to the total number of sections that are offered. The Honors work itself—all Honors work—carries credit toward the degree. Budget estimates for large Honors programs now available are not in the category of forbidding sums when compared with the total budget of a college or university. Such acceleration as is achieved must also be seen as a reduction of these sums. The University of Michigan contemplates a program involving 700 students over 4 years at an annual cost of $160,000; another smaller institution $164,000 as the total cost over a five year period. Two others involve 450 students at a cost of $30,000. But the real question is not whether we can afford a program but whether we can afford *not* to have one, as was stated in the conclusions of the steering committee of the first large Honors conference in Boulder, Colorado, in June 1957.

It remains for me to point to certain other features of emerging Honors programs that are well to bear in mind.

Honors administrators should be in a position, where it seems desirable, to modify standard regulations and red tape rules and requirements for the students in Honors. These were originally worked out for the average student and should not be binding for the superior. Honors students should early be given all available opportunities to serve as apprentices and research assistants in important academic work of the faculty, provided that care be taken that they are not exploited in the relationship. Procedures of evaluation should be built into the program to test the means used and ends achieved. An Honors center, with library, periodicals and lounge should, if possible, be established as at Michigan State, University of Oregon, University of Colorado and Weslyan University.

Finally, it is by no means necessary to assume that before a program can be started all the phases of it, as I have here described them, must first be worked out. Programs can and have been launched with great success by starting with a limited number of offerings for the freshman year alone. This indeed provides the time needed to work out what will be done for these selected students when they become sophomores. It furnishes the faculty with the specific experience of a group of students in Honors. Mistakes can be rectified after one year by changed procedures with next year's entering Honors freshmen, while the initial year's experience itself points concretely to what is needed in Honors offerings for the second year. The first two years will provide departments with concrete suggestions for the departmental programs. The students themselves whom we so often ignore in these matters turn out to be surprisingly helpful in building the program and an appropriately selected committee of Honors students can greatly aid the faculty Honors committee and director in most further planning.

Many other problems will be faced as Honors programs of the kind I have described become well established and develop momentum. Programs will multiply. Experience will be pooled—in identification and selection and in cooperation with high schools; in Honors counselling and in Honors teaching and terminal examining; in the needed accompaniment of evaluation of the means used and ends pursued. There will be a reciprocal pressure for quality as the college Honors programs affect the high schools and as high school programs for the gifted generate increasing challenge to the colleges. There may be a national move to differentiate Honors degrees based on such programs and Honors degrees based on the traditional grade approach. We anticipate that these trends in Honors will have consequences of an important sort in the policies of graduate schools as they are challenged to produce not only scholars as such, but scholar-teachers and humanists of a high order. We are just at the beginning of the new era in Honors.

WHY HONORS PROGRAMS?

William A. Banner
Professor of of Philosophy, Howard University

The problem of the instruction of superior students is part of the larger question of what is basic collegiate education. Clearly one cannot say much about what should be offered to the ablest students of a college without saying a good deal about the conception of education to which a college or university is committed. It is quite likely that the efforts on the part of a Dean of Instruction or of a Committee on Educational Policy to introduce a program for superior students will be opposed by some members of the faculty who will regard such a program as contrary to the general structure of the curriculum or as an expensive innovation for a very small group within the total student body.

Among the many positions which may be taken concerning the place of honors work within the function of the college are the following:

a) an honors program may reflect the prevailing practice in teaching of the majority of the members of a college faculty;
b) an honors program may be accepted as an autonomous enterprise with aims which may be other than those generally acknowledged by a college faculty;
c) an honors program may be regarded as a pilot project the character of which may be accepted in time as a guide for the instruction of all students in a college.

In the acceptance of one of these alternatives will rest the justification of an honors program in a college and the determination of such features of honors work as relate to course content and course procedure.

The *prima facie* justification of an honors program arises from the responsibility of a college to the students who are admitted to study for a degree. In all colleges except those which receive only a very select clientele (and even in these colleges to some extent) there is a wide range in aptitude (or talent), cultural and academic background, and interest among the students who enroll for instruction. It is doubtless improper to speak of any one variable, such as aptitude, apart from other variables which are distinguishable. It would be for a specialist in these matters rather than myself to discuss this point. It is clear, however, that whether because of aptitude or cultural and academic background or interest, or any combination of these variables, there are students in our colleges who are able to perform as early as the freshman year at a level higher than most of their colleagues.

What does this higher performance involve? It is simply the ability to master more quickly the largely predigested materials of the conventional textbook and to reproduce more fully and more accurately such materials in the conventional recitation or examination? This is a kind of superiority but hardly such as to justify the operation of a special program in a college. I am suggesting therefore that the superior student is one who exhibits, beyond any competence which may be found on the high school level, a capacity to handle the ideas or concepts which underlie the order and integration of knowledge. Such students require a course of study which is both richer in content and more flexible in plan and execution than what is available to and justifiable for the majority of the students of a college. I take it to be the responsibility of a college to provide such a program running for the four years of college, to provide for the reception of the "late bloomer," and to provide careful supervision of performance in classroom and in independent study.

A less immediate but more explicit justification of honors work must be offered, however. Honors work is ultimately justified, it would seem, in representing at the highest level of performance the distinct character of the college. The attention to preparation for vocational life as well as the attention to the correction of deficiency in high school study has meant that in many places the character as well as the content of collegiate education is scarcely distinguishable from the character and content of secondary and vocational education. Whatever may be said for these functions which have, let us say, been thrust upon the college, the attention to them has in many instances pushed aside or depressed the intellectual life of the college.

I am aware that here I am getting into the deep water of controversy in daring to say something about the distinct function of a college or university. I am also aware that some of the pressure for programs for superior students has come from individuals who are not interested primarily in the intellectual life but in a supply of technicians and engineers who will help to keep things competitive in the cold war.

Honors work, it would seem, cannot be a matter simply of intensifying or accelerating the course work as now offered by a college, particularly where this work is not basically collegiate in character. What is required is a review of the *kind* of work which is being offered in the entire curriculum in the light of the character of collegiate study as an intellectual enterprise. If honors work in a college does not represent a prevailing intellectual spirit in that college, it can easily become either a special form of prevailing academic triviality or an isolated and expensive innovation which is unrelated to basic instruction for all students.

I am suggesting, therefore, that an honors program cannot be justified merely as *another* program of a college. It is justified ultimately as a program which represents the intellectual function of the college at the level of its ablest students, the discharge of which function must in a real way pervade the whole life of a college.

DESIRABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF HONORS PROGRAMS

VIVIAN J. TELLIS
Associate Professor of English, Southern University

In the consideration of this topic, "Desirable Characteristics of Honors Programs," the word *characteristic* will be interpreted with as broad a meaning as it can bear. This is not to suggest a proposal to throw together a hodgepodge of terms without differentiation, delineation, or definition. Rather, the implication is that the kind of discussion intended here necessitates two types of listing: the one embodying the practical and tangible demands of an effective honors program, the other those characteristics which are idealistic and intangible in nature but which are none the less meaningful and pertinent. Moreover, it is obvious to anyone who has given even the most cursory attention to the varied kinds of procedures in numerous institutions which all in one way or another enjoy alliance with the general concept of academic honors and honors programs that only a quite extensive and comprehensive list would adequately comprise all the qualities which should characterize an honors program. Limitations of this discussion, however, encourage a discriminating selection of those characteristics which may be regarded as fundamental to an honors program whether it consists of a complete outline of college courses from the freshman through the senior years or a single colloquium for a small group of entering freshmen.

If the ideas presented here are dictated by prejudice, such dictation is not intentional. Some are suggested by direct experience, some from knowledge of honors programs gained through reading and oral interchange of ideas. To those who have over the years followed honors programs in concept or in practice, therefore, there will likely be nothing new in what is said in this presentation;

for those whose thinking on the matter is in an incipient stage, there will be, it is hoped, sufficient suggestion for thought toward development of some valid points of view. Nor is it beyond modesty to suggest that those in the former category may find new confirmation for the ends which they entertain with respect to programs already well established. No claim is made for the relative importance of these characteristics; suffice it to say that all of them are regarded as indispensable.

Let us begin with some practical reflections. An honors program should be characterized by smooth administration. Nothing can be more disturbing and disconcerting to the participants, both students and teachers alike, than administratiev detail which obtrudes itself into the forefront in such a way as to engage the primary attention of the honors teachers and sometimes even of the students. Hard experience is teaching us that the more the teacher can be freed for the purely instructional phases of the programs, the more successful the program will be. If there is not sufficient manpower available apart from the actual instructional force to work out details of procedure involving identification processes, registration, retention, withdrawals, and the like, then such matters might best be handled in committees drawn from the honors faculty but meeting apart from any regular sessions designed for the group. This course leaves the faculty free in its sessions together to concentrate attention upon the techniques and the content of instruction. Moreover, continued experience will teach those interested to anticipate the difficulties and problems which may arise and thereby to cross bridges before coming to them. What is most important is that the teaching-learning process go forward with a minimum of interruption and misunderstanding. If the aim of an honor program is to tap the potential among the brightest students, every caution must be taken to prevent the loss of any single student as a result of administrative bungling.

A second desirable characteristic of an honors program is effective teaching. The concern here is not with what constitutes effective teaching but rather with the conditions which make effective teaching possible. These conditions comprise two essentials: one, a certain type of teacher and two, certain physical requisites. As for the teacher, he should be a person who has arrived at some very positive convictions. In the first place, he should feel assured that the honors approach is a tenable one. He should be convinced that singling out the student of high academic potential does no violence to the theory of good instruction, no violence to the personalities of the students, both those included in and those excluded from the program, no violence to the democratic principles of the educative process. If he does not hold these convictions, he will be a lukewarm teacher; and a lukewarm teacher will be a serious detriment to any honors program. Then he should be a teacher who has developed some personal convictions growing out of the depth and breadth of his own serious contemplation of great thoughts and compelling issues. An honors teacher should bring to his students a richness of learning that challenges and inspires. The other essential to effective teaching, certain physical requisites, includes at its best especially designated meeting places properly furnished, adequate library facilities, small classes. Ideally, an honors group would meet in a room reserved for its use where the students could gather in comfort and freedom. If the library cannot provide a separate study room for honors students, it should at all events accord them whatever privileges are consonant with the greatest freedom in the use of its services.

A third desideratum for an honors program is adequate financial support. This suggestion is made without any sure knowledge of what it means in actual dollars and cents but with the equally sure knowledge that some cost is involved. For one thing, the nature of any given honors program will be the primary determinant of its cost. Obviously an elaborate organization that reaches all levels of undergraduate study and extends as well into departments will be a more costly venture than one of more modest proportions, possibly touching only a small percentage of a single class. Some costs which are obvious and largely initial, such as furniture for classrooms and books for library use, do not usually pose a major problem. Others which involve teachers' salaries, mounting expenses resulting from reduced pupil-teacher ratio, and the like demand the argumentative skill of the most dedicated proponents of honors teaching. Whatever the case, the incontrovertible truth is that the most satisfactory honors program will be the one which is ably supported by adequate finance.

So much for the very practical aspects of this discussion. The other desirable characteristics to be mentioned here may be classed as intangibles, sometimes strongly colored, however, by certain practical requirements. The first of these is flexibility. The very tentative nature of honors programs on many campuses argues strongly for this quality. This flexibility should take two directions: that within an already adopted program and that which reaches outside an existing program toward possible expansion beyond the current limits. This suggestion, then, implies on the one hand an almost certain modification of any given procedure as a result of pure trial and error and growth through experiences. It implies that there is no one way either to administer an honors program or to teach honors classes or groups. To just the extent that there is a willingness to remold procedures will there exist the greatest likelihood of achieving the most nearly ideal conditions. On the other hand, the suggestion implies the possibility of extending the honors viewpoint into every area of college learning. Such an extension would appear to be highly desirable for it would lend the final justification to the principles of bestowing special attention upon the academically talented.

On a more abstract level there is a great need for enthusiasm. This quality must surely come from within the honors program itself, taking its impetus from the "passionate few" who are firmly persuaded of its virtue. Teachers and administrators of such a program must catch fire from one another and infuse the students who enter it with a similar spirit. The reward is twofold: teachers and students nourish each other with their enthusiastic zeal in the pursuit of knowledge and the warmth of their interest extends itself into the general college atmosphere, arousing a healthy curiosity and eventually engendering an active concern. Such interaction cannot fail to bolster the morale of program participants as well as increase the influence of the program on the campus.

A third intangible is prestige. An honors program must through its impact on the college campus support the doctrine that there is worth in being studious and scholarly. This prestige must be won first on the college campus itself among the officers of administration, the teachers, and the students. The initial step toward this prestige is making the college campus aware of the existence of an honors program. Numerous avenues may be employed—the college paper, faculty meetings, student assemblies, and just plain conversation. Once the awareness has been established, the force and effectiveness of the program itself must be relied upon to do much of the rest. In short, after the initial phase, indirection will most certainly do more than any frontal approach. Prestige in the college community may be earned by a similar route. It will doubtless come after and by a gradual process. But it is certain that any honors program will survive only if it wins the respect of the total college community.

Closely allied to prestige and appearing as a natural consequence of it is another characteristic, status. Prestige gives assurance that the honors program has become an accepted part of the whole college program; status gives assurance that it has become a recognized part. Eventually this recognition takes official form in a catalog statement attesting to the place of honors in the formal pattern of the academic program of the college. This recognition is the ultima Thule of the honors program, for by this fact the program becomes an established entity with continuing and unlimited possibilities for growth.

ORGANIZING AND ADMINISTERING HONORS PROGRAMS

CECIL G. TAYLOR
Dean, College of the Arts and Sciences
Louisiana State University

In the educational venture, administration comprises those actions that are conceived to facilitate the faculty enterprise. There are many administrative actions that fall into a category that might be designated as good housekeeping, but the more important ones are usually less concrete. The basic role of the administrator is to grasp faculty concepts for an operation, to interpret them in relation to the nature of the institution and its resources, and then to marshall personal and physical assets in support of the program planned. In a more casual way, I usually define my role of administrator as involving my time and energies to the extent of about 25% in working directly on a project and to the extent of 75% in what I call "laying down green carpets"—oiling the machinery, calming stormy waters, serving as arbitrator, seeking workable compromises.

Just as good teaching involves taking the steps necessary to elicit a maximum release of well-directed cerebral energy on the part of the student, so good administration amounts to eliciting a miximum release of faculty energies toward the attainment of the goal set.

Before one decides on a particular form of organization or on plans for administration, some basic decisions must be reached as to the goals to be achieved; and then the organization and administration can be tailored to fit the purposes to be served. I keep constantly in the back of my mind a statement once made by Mr. Conant while he was still at Harvard. He said, in referring to interdepartmental instruction, that he had never seen two departments very satisfactorily co-operative in this respect but he had often observed individuals from different departments work very well together on joint instructional undertakings. Since honors work needs to be programmed and is to an appreciable extent interdepartmental work, this observation of Mr. Conant seems to me worthy of attention as a basic condition of academic life to be reckoned with by any administrator engaging in the direction of honors work.

An initial problem in the establishment of an honors program—and a problem of prime importance—is the determination of goals. If we could draw up a precise set of specifications as to what we expect the end product of an honors program to be, the determination of the program itself would be made considerably easier. But in education we are not in the business of producing packaged goods nor is our goal one that can be satisfactorily expressed in quantitative terms. And so, a degree of uncertainty or inspecificness as to our end product makes the task difficult. However, any institution establishing honors, if it wants to do more than simply apply a label, must establish objectives. An administrator can do nothing more important perhaps than to assist his faculty honors group achieve a working consensus as to aims. Without this a program is almost inevitably committed to superficiality, to meaningless much ado about nothing. Any consensus achieved is only temporary, and so a continuing critical review and refinement of aims are necessary. The foregoing already implies more than the efforts of an administrator; in any drawing up of objectives definite lines between administrative action and faculty action could hardly be drawn. But, the administrator will likely have done one specific thing; in his role as a kind of personnel man he will have been carefully assessing faculty assets for the project, and he will have been responsible for bringing together those faculty members appearing most disposed and most able to undertake the project. Very early the administrator will have designated an honors council, composed of faculty members working vigorously to achieve the honors aims; and a director of honors (or coordinator as we call him at

LSU) will have been named—preferably a faculty member of undoubted prestige among his colleaques.

Remembering the implications of the statement of Mr. Conant that our academic departments do not work well together on matters not strictly their own, the administrator is obliged to create a home for honors in the organizational structure of the institution. Abstractly this home is to be found with the director of honors and his council, but it is important that there be a tangible physical home too. This may be just the office of the director and his staff, or it may be something more extensive to include special rooms for colloquia, reading rooms for honors students, and even collections of books and recorded materials.

A director, a council, and a home for honors will constitute the basic necessities for promoting a program; and then the chief administrative problems to be dealt will fall into categories such as these:

1. Those related to the identification and selection of honors students (presupposing criteria and machinery for making the selection);
2. Those related to the planning and offering of special sections and courses for honors students;
3. Those related to staffing for honors courses and sections;
4. Those related to counseling for honors students;
5. And finally, the category that for the administrator summarizes all others, those related to budget.

In summary, an administrator is essentially a planner, a personnel man, and a budget man. And he must be no mean persuader; he must be able to sell an honors program to a faculty, which will do the work, and to an administration, which will provide financial support. Though an administrator may normally be viewed as the very voice of conservatism and orthodoxy, there must be in him also a bit of the iconoclast. If he views the various academic formulas and regulations as very sacred, the likelihood of a favorable climate for honors developing is remote.

As the number of persons going to college has grown and grown, our institutions have been obliged to develop complex organizations to provide for them. The complex organization has made possible an orderly and efficient operation, but it has not always been flexible enough to permit the variations necessary for the best education of all kinds of youth with their multiple individual differences. For one thing, the three-hour class is almost hallowed; almost hallowed, too, is the fact that it meets with regularity at 9 A.M. TThS or 2 P.M. MWF, or on some comparable schedule for a minimum of 45 50-minute periods to yield three semester hour credits. Orderliness is imperative in a big operation, and no big institution can function without it. And, yet, the orderliness we have may be the kind that is effective with many but even destructive of progress in special cases, some of which may be our brightest student. Though ordered disciplining of the mind constitutes an important facet of the educating process, provision for free flight of the gifted is also especially important. The whole task is to discover all the variable conditions and devices by which energies are released, minds and imaginations are excited, curious intellectual appetites are whetted.

The honors instructor needs to be sensitive to his honors students. If a student can be moved to do more and better work by reducing the three classes per week course to two or even one meeting, then the sacred schedule should be tampered with. Perhaps the finest role the administrator can fill with respect to honors is that of principal agent in breaking the academic lock-step and in establishing the freedom and flexibility necessary for optimum instruction of the talented. An alert administrator will acquaint himself with the experience of other institutions in developing honors programs, but he will do this in the full knowledge that there are no pat formulas that suit the particular nature and purposes of every institution, that a pattern for one institution is not transplantable *in toto* to another institution. And, finally I would say the alert administrator will see that our honors program gets to be identified as a project of the faculty, and not of the administration—or even better still as a project of the faculty supported by the administration.

TEACHING SUPERIOR STUDENTS THROUGH HONORS PROGRAMS

JOHN HICKS
Executive Director, College English Association

Honors teaching is good teaching — teaching done naturally by a person with excellent scholarly grasp of his subject, the enthusiasm to think that it matters intensely to his students, and the histrionics needed to organize and present his material effectively. Honors teaching may be done in a lecture hall with 500 students, if the lecturer is competent, intelligent, compelling. It may be done in a class of 30 or a small seminar, or in a private conference. Honors teaching is simply good teaching under the circumstance— but the circumstance must include the absence of the nice but uninterested fellow classmates, the dull and the unmotivated who clog the room and the hour.

Teaching by means of a true honors program implies more. The *program* implied is the whole academic career of one individual student, planned with individual concern. Although honors teaching may be done in class or private situation, the total process may fail to take shape into an honors program, each of which must be individual; the recognition of one student's unique needs and unique capacities. It is contrapuntal: an interplay between the expectations of an ideal curriculum, and the actualities of a promising youth: some of his capacities racing far beyond any standard curriculum, some of his incapacities and ill-preparednesses being an inversion of all that we normally hope for.

In offering to create honors programs, a college should be aware of its aims and hopes. Its goal should be to make the superior student into an independent scholar, able to carry on the dialogue of intellectual discovery and exploration, self-reliant and humble. It should help a student develop a framework of valid relationships about which to organize the more and more complex structure of his learning—complex but organized, never a jumble of quiz-program facts and trivia. It aims to realize the desperate need for integrity and completeness, rather than the incomplete and the shoddy. And it will try to create a situation in which the student senses that he is a respected apprentice in learning, to whom his professor should soon become unnecessary without becoming superfluous.

Teaching by the honors program implies that students will be selected wisely, not by an evaluation of grades alone. The student of honors quality is not necessarily one with highest grades, either an entrance or later in his college career. He may have been bored by many of the pedestrian processes of school and college; he may have been mistaught by inferior teachers who resented his capacities; he may have been devoting his time to real but personal learning. But he is the student who glows with enthusiasm. One college I wrote to said that it had no program for superior students, but did have a program for students with superior motivation. *This* student is our honors student. From the time a student reaches college, and until he proves himself otherwise, he should be treated as potentially an honors student. If, for example, he chooses to try to do the work of a required course independently, consulting the instructor more or less, then let him. If we set up our program and our awards for this kind of student, we will find many of our routine performers, collectors of A's and B's, disappearing from our lists. Theirs is a passive, not an active education.

Teaching by an honors program implies mutual encouragement and education of superior students by each other. It will bring them together socially and scholastically, and give them such privileges as they can use wisely. A student of superior ability knows that he is so. His superiority has been something he has had to ilve with most of his life—perhaps an embarrassment, something to dissemble, if his life has been spent in average school systems among average companions. In college, at least, he should find that abilities are a ground for unity with similar students. They should be provided a place for meeting and talking, and activities and cultural opportunities that encourage their solidarity and self-education. I do not mean that they should be isolated from campus society. A superior student deserves no privilege which simply marks him off from his fellow students. Nothing should be done to reward him for being intelligent—everything should be done to aid his making fullest use of his itnelligence. Unity with other superior students, and such privileges as special library provisions, or meetings with visiting artists and dignitaries, are his because they directly relate to his self-education.

Teaching by honors program implies giving the honors student, as quickly as possible, freedom from all requirements of courses, hours, grades, credit points. Honors learning should be carried on in an atmosphere of freedom. At least by the start of the junior year, and preferably earlier, a student should be freed from the rigmarole of the IBM machine, the grade point average, the standard curriculum, and the objective standardized tests—they are not appreciators of wisdom and quality. The last two years of college for a capable student should be devoted to a personal, self-disciplined, wisely-tutored, complex but never disorganized pursuit of self-education. The freshman and sophomore years should be a period of apprenticeship in freedom and self-education. Students of merit should, early, be brought together in seminar and special class, where they can proceed to a level of achievement not even dreamed of or dared in standard courses which they displace. Any student who wishes to try to do all the work of a course independently should be allowed, and should prove his mastery in some kind of testing that reveals real appreciation of the materials, not a mere text-book grasp. Primary materials and independent projects should displace pre-digested and simplified textbooks. But an honors program, while it is free, should be disciplined and unlicensed. An honors program is not an escape from the idea of a curriculum. A university which has thoughtfully set up a clear, realistic curriculum has merely asserted the norm by which a good education can be judged. Once we have firmly established a situation of freedom from routinization and the IBM processes, we can see courses and class work in their true perspective, and even make excellent use of them. When a student and his tutor-adviser know where he is going, they are in a position to estimate the value to him of particular courses. It would be a terrible waste if certain students did not take certain courses with certain professors. Student and adviser can determine which courses offer the most economical means of mastering some part but not all, of other courses are useful *to him*; and the honors student will be given *carte blanche* to attend just so much of a certain class as he and his adviser decide. He is not earning hours and credits. He is attending a class because he knows its value; he attends out of a love of learning, and both encourages and compliments the teacher by doing so.

At the heart of each honors program, therefore, must be some faculty member who is scholar and teacher and adviser and tutor. He must have the sympathy, the breadth of interest, the flexibility to carry forward the superior student in a week-by-week dialogue of learning, shaping into a meaningful wholeness all his classes and extra-curricula engagements and independent studies. He is not helping the student to escape anything. Rather he is helping a student to give totality to his college career: More intense, more philosophical, more fulfilling than would be the race around a standard curriculum designed for a standard student. He must see in proper perspective the uses of established courses, of special colloquia and seminars, of library and laboratory—and of himself, that he may remain useful and yet in the long run dispensable.

The tutor-scholar-adviser-teacher need to be carefully chosen (chosen by both the college and the student) for an enthusiasm for teaching and scholarship which communicates itself to students—at least to one student. He should not be chosen for his seniority; not for his position in the politics of faculty life; not for the bibliography of quickie publications, which passes for scholarship and drives out mature, slow-growing scholarship, as bad money is said to drive out good. He should be guaranteed (as should all good teachers) that teaching is a professional virtue for which promotion is sure, whether he publish or not. There is no better place to publish real scholarship and wisdom than in the minds of good students.

Learning in an honors program implies an organic structure, sensitive at every point to change and maturing, yet firm and clear. Freedom for an honors student in the junior and senior years, and the semi-freedom of preparation in the freshman and sophomore years, do not mean license. No student should be allowed to go off into a corner and devote himself to minute but one-sided pursuits. At least weekly meetings with his major adviser, and preferably frequent consultations with other interested faculty members, should keep him aware of the possibilities of learning which, isolated, he might miss. His program of studies will be clearly outlined from the time he begins—clear as to general aim and at to first steps; but not rigidly. As new realizations and new possibilities open to the student, the program should evolve with them, enlarging its aims and embracing new and more complex developments. A student who does not grow to new aims is likely less meritorious than we had hoped.

Teaching by an honors program should encourage breadth, not only within one discipline, but equally between disciplines. Probably the most insistent mark of a student of honors capacity is his power of relating and synthesizing learning. Quiz-program learning—isolated facts and ideas—is the most frustrating of all experiences to an intelligence. In his collegiate immaturity he is rarely able yet to create for himself a sufficiently comprehensive structure of relationships. His faculty adviser and tutor should be more commodious—more broadly sophisticated and cultivated—so that he can help his student to see larger relationships and to extend himself beyond the bonds of his present discipline.

A sense of proportion and relationship is especially valuable to an honors student, who does much of his work independently. Many colleges have instituted interdisciplinary or general education courses of high calibre; honors students should be expected to complete requirements in such courses, preferably in select groups. Moreover, during their junior and senior years, they should be provided with planned breadth, in the form of seminars or colloquia which bring together honors students from different disciplines, approaching a common topic of human endeavor. Here they can exchange understanding across boundaries of field and discipline, where even their learned professors are often lamentably lacking. Honors students should be on at least speaking acquaintance with the whole world of the intellect. How else will they keep the prospective which saves one from absurdity in his too-narrow field?

An honors program of interdisciplinary breadth implies such breadth for the teacher as well as for the student. Here both student and faculty member can be companions in learning and in interdisciplinary exchange. One advantage of such seminars is the tactful humility of both teacher and student before the body of man's intellectual heritage, which no one man can hope to master but in which all should see their own learning as a valuable part, the more valuable when in the most just perspective.

There should be some tangible evidence of that continuity which should run through the whole of a good honors program. This evidence may be a scholar's journal, in which he keeps his bibliographies, his notes and private observations on readings and on conferences with faculty, and which he adds all the papers that he has written either in class or for his adviser. For he writes regularly in the process of reporting upon his studies and of discovering for himself what he has learned by shaping and giving expression to his growing insight and knowledge. Passive and objectively examinable learning will be deprecated as fully as possible, whereas the journal will record the active and self-cultivating activities of a mind in growth, precise and eventually voluminous.

Teaching by the honors program implies a severe program of final examinations, but one appropriate to the aim and the method embodied. Of course, in a real sense one cannot test the results of an honors program, short of following the life process of the individual as it unfolds. But for practical purposes we must rely upon these methods of evaluation:

the record contained in the scholar's journal, including the papers and other records of what he has produced as he progressed;

the judgment of the teacher-scholars with whom he has had contact through his career, especially the last two years;

a comprehensive written examination of real length, covering the whole field which the student professes; asking questions which show not only an accumulation of knowledge, but also ability to use that knowledge imaginatively to real problems;

an examination in depth upon the special area in which the student has worked most intensively, aiming again at both knowledge and its wise uses;

a public oral examination, in which the student exhibits the readiness and the flexibility with which he can handle his learning in a human situation.

With these evidences before it, a governing committee of honors programs should be able to make the most valid judgment possible of the degree of honor with which an honors student has achieved his goal: not as a collector of objective data and credit points, but as a total integrated human being well-informed and capable of shaping, synthesizing, and using learning.

HIGH SCHOOL RELATIONS AND COLLEGE HONORS

William H. Robinson
Director, Division of Teacher Education
Hampton Institute

Unless they are late, late bloomers, it can be expected that students who have the ability to study for honors in college were mentally superior long before they set foot on a college campus. And unless their brightness was kept carefully concealed under bushels of scholastic indifference, mediocre teaching, extracurricula activities, adjustment schemes, and belongingness during elementary and secondary school careers, it can also be expected that their teachers found out about the superior mental capacities of these students. It may be even suspected that through the wonderful process of self-discovery many of these students became aware of the fact that they were potential egg-heads.

Despite these relations, however, many, many boys and girls with superior mental capacities, by which I mean unusual aptitude for learning or great ability to learn, are not the creations of education, and obviously the school cannot endow these capacities. But when such a child enters school, it is the responsibility of the teachers and administrators to identify them and encourage them to develop fully this endowment so that the mentally superior youngster becomes academically talented.

If students come to college with ability to cope with the challenge of honors study, or develop this ability after they have spent one or more semesters in college, it follows that they would be even better scholastically had they been identified earlier and encouraged to develop their capacities more fully during their elementary and secondary school careers. Early identification of superior students is important for another reason. Too often pupils with superior ability are never discovered because they are unfortunate enough to be in school situations where there is no giftedness detecting radar in operation. Since the mentally superior pupils must be regarded as the proper objects of higher education, the responsibility of the college in assisting in their identification and encouragement becomes an educational imperative.

Although the topic of this panel is, "High School Relations and College Honors", we must say for the record that each of us recognizes that the identification and encouragement of the superior student at the high school level is too little, too late. Until the process is started down in the grades, it must be admitted that we are aiming way above the center of the target. About the only argument that we can advance for not going below the secondary school grades in our search for intellectually superior students that it is better than waiting until they enter college.

I know of no theories of identifying superior students at the high school level that have not been put into practice in many parts of the country. It would be ridiculous for me to come all the way from Hampton to report to you examples of practices which are already reported in literature which is available to you; consequently I feel that I would be on safer grounds if I reported to you an experiment which we are conducting at Hampton Institute in cooperation with three high schools in the immediate vicinity of the campus. At least this approach will meet the criterion of relevancy as far as my topic is concerned because it is an example of high school relations and college honors, and more specifically it falls within two of the sub-topics assigned to this panel: "Identification and Encouragement", "(Modified) Advanced Placement". Notice I have dropped one word—"Early"—from one of the sub-topics and have added one word—"modified"—to the other. This I have done because in the example I shall relate the identification is not early and a modified version of the advanced placement idea is employed.

Early in the spring of 1958 I dropped in on the principals of the three high schools, which are within a radius of ten miles of Hampton Institute, and asked this question: "What are you doing for your superior pupils?" The answers were different in all but these respects—they were all long and apologetic and each principal wanted to do something for his superior pupils. I then made this proposal to each of the principals:

> Let us administer a series of achievement and intelligence tests to your eleventh graders, and pick out the superior ones. You refine our selections through the use of school grades and teachers' judgement, and in the fall let these pupils take our freshman courses in those areas in which they rank at the thirteenth grade level and above.

For reasons of his own each of the three principals set up a class for superior pupils in English, and one also set up a class in college mathematics.

The English Department at the college furnished their Freshman English outlines, textbook titles, and bibliographies. A college instructor who taught an average freshman English section on the campus was relieved of part of her teaching load and was assigned to work with the three high school teachers offering the college English courses. Her main job was to make certain that the work done by the school pupils was at least at the level of that done by the college freshman. The same standards of performance were employed for the high school and college student, and identical tests and other evaluative criteria were used with both groups.

In the school which provided a special mathematics course for students with superior ability in this field, it was found to my embarassment that the general course in mathematics offered at the college was inadequate. Instead of the college freshman course in general mathematics, a semester course in plane trigonometry and one in analytic geometry was given. The same working arrangements as those followed for the English course were used with the mathematics course.

Since this experiment was initiated in the 1958-1959 school term, it is too early to measure its outcome with any degree of conclusiveness. It is true that on a whole the high school pupils performed better than the average ability college group with which they were compared. Forty-two of the sixty-two pupils in the three special high school classes enrolled in college in the fall of 1959. The thirty-five about whom information has been received were placed in sophomore English at eleven different colleges. Some were given advanced placement on the basis of the college course taken in high school; others were granted advanced placement on the basis of their performance of placement or entrance tests.

Only two of the eight pupils who took the college course in mathematics entered college. Both were placed in calculus upon entering. There is not yet sufficient information on the progress of these students in college to make any follow-up report.

The experiment has been continued for the 1959-60 school term. Plans are now under way to initiate classes for superior juniors in these three high schools during the coming year.

Unfortunately, we do not have any honors program for freshmen at Hampton Institute, although we are certain that the practice of placing high school graduates who have taken college courses in high school in regular courses at a higher level is most unsatisfactory. The Committee on Instruction is studying plans to extend the honors program, which now includes courses for upper class students, to a complete four year program throughout the General Education Program, and to many of the specialized areas of study.

Another effort being made at Hampton to provide special opportunities for the superior student is the Pre-college Summer Program. Each summer, superior high school graduates spend six-weeks on the campus living in the dormitories, taking two courses (English and mathematics), and engaging in cultural activities.

Planning is now under way to unify all aspects of the several efforts now being made and anticipated for superior students—both high school and college. This will coordinate the Pre-college, including (1) special classes in the high school for superior juniors and seniors; (2) superior study on the campus for superior high school graduates; and (3) a four-year college honors program, including general and departmental honors.

TO EDUCATE ALL THE JEFFERSONIANS

JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN
Chairman, Department of History,
Brooklyn City College

One of the most perplexing problems in a society filled with perplexing problems is posed by this question: How can we give adequate opportunity and encouragement to the academically talented and, at the same time, maintain our commitment to the widely cherished principle of democratic education? It is a problem that is certainly as old as the movement for universal education; and it became increasingly difficult and complex as public responsibility increased and as the concept of equality emerged as one of the most important ingredients in the new definition of democracy in the early nineteenth century. The problem was dramatized by the transition from the Jeffersonian commitment to intellectual excellence and superiority to the Jacksonian commitment to broadening educational opportunity with little regard for intellectual excellence. Unfortunately, this transition implied that it was undemocratic to place emphasis on anything in which all the people could not share. Thus, it was felt that the principle of democracy in education should lead to establishment of a system in which no special treatment would be accorded to any group or individual. Democratic education in the context of Jacksonian democracy meant *equality* in the educational process.

For the Jacksonians there was no compromise, no halfway point at which the system could reconcile education for the talented with education for the great numbers. Jacksonianism meant equality, pure and simple, and it made no concessions to the aristocracy of intellect or to the existence of superior talents. Soon, this became the dominant theme not only in the establishment of the educational system of our country but in the shaping of most of our other institutions and practices. No special considerations should be given to any group or individual, for equality of condition was a mark of true democracy. This position was advanced with a vigor that bordered on passion and could be seen in many phases of political and social life as well as in the field of education.

Alexis de Tocqueville saw this trend and regarded it as dangerous to the healthy growth of American democracy. The commitment of democratic nations to the idea of equality is at all times very strong, he asserted, "but there are certain epochs at which the passion they entertain for it swells to the height of fury. This occurs at the moment when the old social system, long menaced, is overthrown after a severe internal struggle, and the barriers of rank are at length thrown down. At such times men pounce upon equality as their booty, and they cling to it as to some precious treasure they fear to lose." The passion for equality, therefore, obscured the importance of recognizing the intellectually gifted in a democratic order. The passion for equality discouraged the establishment of policies and institutions that would stimulate and encourage the academically talented. The tradition persisted that the only gifts to be recognized were those that sent the person to the top against incredible odds. The greater the obstacles the better for the person and the greater the praise for his having overcome them. The self-made man thus became the idol of America, and only *after* he had made his mark was he recognized as a man of talents. We made virtures out of these talents and called them initiative, individualism, perseverance, imagination.

That this country has tended to exalt the doer rather than the thinker is not so much a testimony to an overriding anti-intellectualism in American life as it is the operation of an historical fact. The task of developing a new country involved the utilization of brawn almost as much as brains, and the institutions, economic, social, and even educational, were essentially the product of experience and urgent necessity. It is no accident, therefore, that our early colleges were established to train a ministry to succeed those early ones after they "shall lie in the dust," as the Harvard charter declared. These were the designated guardians of what intellectual and cultural life there was in the colonies, and they were the only ones for whom education was deemed really necessary. It is likewise no accident that when the American public began to assume responsibility for higher education, it related that education, in the land-grant colleges, to the practical, everyday problems confronting the American people. There was still little place for the person whose sole or most significant contribution was to the world of ideas. Should he persist he would be lucky if he suffered no more than an indulgent tolerance from a disinterested populace.

With such traditions that have attached little importance to education, except somewhat begrudgingly to "practical" education, it has been almost impossible to identify and encourage those who have talents that could, under proper conditions, be developed for the benefit of all mankind. Those who have assumed the responsibility for injecting quality into our system of universal education and who have insisted on recognizing the academically talented as national assets have experienced difficulties and opposition. When time gives us the proper perspective with which to view it, I have no doubt that it will appear incredible. Whether it is an Emerson urging his fellows to give the proper attention to the life of the mind or a Robert Oppenheimer paying tribute to the importance of the intellectual community to the survival of civilization, the deaf ears turned to such observations are, indeed, discouraging.

The task of overcoming the obstacles to recognizing and encouraging intellectual excellence was, until rather recently, assumed by that lone teacher here and there who made it a part of his personal responsibility. Long after universal education became a national policy and long after the colleges and universities were filled with students seeking one thing or another, the identification and the encouragement of the superior student remained a random, haphazard activity to which the institution, as a whole, remained uncommitted. There were the scholarships, of course, except that most of them were given to athletes or, at best, given to the neediest. There were the scholarship societies, dean's lists, and honors convocations, to be sure. But these occasions and institutions paid tribute to the unique feats of those who, somehow, survived the ordeal of Jacksonian education and, in the end, clearly indicated that they deserved more than they received.

Only in recent years have our educational institutions given systematic attention to the academically talented. It is a happy phenomenon that belongs primarily to the period following the last war. Perhaps it was a belated recognition of the obvious value to the nation of those who had made significant contributions to the national welfare because of their superior talent and training. Certainly the New Deal and war years demonstrated their importance and doubtless stimulated the drive to capitalize on such talents in the future by providing greater opportunities for the development of those talents. Gradually the techniques for identifying the talented students were explored, provisions were made for them to pursue their education without distraction or interruption, and methods were devised for the greater realization of their academic potential. The current programs to carry on this work are many and varied. They range from the College Honors Program and the Scholars' Program at my own institution to the general promotion of programs for the academically talented under the auspices of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student. A casual reading of any Newsletter of the Inter-University Committee would confirm the view that the country is becoming deeply aware of the great asset it possesses in its academically talented talent which, at long last, it is becoming committed to encourage.

All that I have said with regard to the growing interest in education either of the Jeffersonians or the Jacksonians in our society is subject to substantial, material qualifications when one recalls that ours is a multi-cultured, multi-religious, multi-racial society. For some Europeans who settled in the New World their commitment to the cultivation of the superior mind was so deep that they were affected only slightly by the curiously pragmatic approach to education in this country. Others were so certain that educational institutions should be church-related that they paid little attention to the movement for universal education and were more disposed to give encouragement to the academically talented and the religiously oriented. Meanwhile, the many who sought universal education or the few who wanted to encourage the superior student actually had in mind white universal education or the encouragement of the superior student *provided* he were white.

Perhaps nothing has blighted the drive for universal education in the United States more than the self-contradictory notion that universal education should be confined to white people. Perhaps nothing has made a caricature of the current drive to identify and encourage the academically talented more than the concurrently prevailing practice of segregated education and cultural degradation that makes such identification and encouragement extremely difficult, if not impossible. If the early Jacksonian drive for equality in education was a perversion and a distortion by demanding the same education for the moron that was provided for the genius, the Negro escaped the influence of that particular perversion. Meanwhile he was subjected to another that was even worse. It was the view, supported in law, that Negroes should have equality in ignorance only, that no black person should have an education, whether he be a moron or a genius.

This position that was translated by law into policy merely reflected a widely held view that a Negro was unworthy and incapable of becoming a participant in or a contributor to the culture or even the amenities of so-called civilized society. The view persisted that Negroes were a degraded lot, pariahs of the land, condemned to be and to remain the slaves and servants of whites. They were not capable of acquiring an education and, in the event that some had the mental equipment, it was a crime for them to learn or be taught. They were to be kept apart in every relationship that did not ensure subordination. After freedom another body of customs and laws fixed their status. Among them were segregation in education, housing and practically everything else; discrimination in education with Negroes getting barely the crumbs from the public funds, disfranchisement that made it impossible to exercise any political influence, and general denigration by some of the most artful and imaginative schemes of humiliation ever devised by man.

The cultural and intellectual blight produced by such a widespread, wholesale effort to destroy the personality and the dignity of the Negro is impossible to measure. One can merely survey it, describe it, and get some sense of the effect of such experiences on a Negro as a person, to say nothing of the effect on him as a potential scholar. It goes without saying that his basic training is inadequate, making it extremely difficult for him to pursue advanced training. His motivation is destroyed or seriously impaired, since he comes from a home that society has dehumanized and looks toward a future that is indeed dark as far as intellectual growth is concerned. His appreciation for the better things of the mind and spirit is numbed by the battle he must wage for physical survival in a world that even insists on purchasing his labor on the basis of race instead of ability or competence. How can there emerge from such a culturally disadvantaged group any considerable number of talented persons whose prognosis for significant academic achievement is promising? This constitutes a major tragedy, perhaps *the* major tragedy, in American life.

It can be argued with some success that things are rapidly improving in many ways. Perhaps things are improving even in the area of education and even, perhaps, in the program to encourage excellence in academic achievement. One must be careful, however, not to equate certain kinds of physical improvements with the improvement of the intellectual climate. The white public in the South has been subjected to enormous pressure to equalize educational opportunity. Its general reaction has been resistance. Where it has made concessions, it has been primarily in the area of physical facilities. It can be argued that the improvement of physical facilities has itself become a major technique to maintain segregation in public education and to divert attention from the more substantial and meaningful aspects of the academic life.

One gets the impression that the entire South is subscribing to the view expressed by one official that if $100,000 will keep one Negro out of the state university, it is money well spent. Thus, some Negro high schools and colleges are becoming veritable palaces in comparison with the previous housing and physical facilities that were provided Negroes from public funds. Some Negro state colleges, moreover, are gaining not only the appearance but are getting some of the atmosphere of swank country clubs. I know of one that can boast of its air-conditioned snack bar, but it would prefer not to discuss its book collection. Highly touted marching and racing bands, winning football teams on which play the students who win all the so-called scholarships, and fancy auditoriums and expensive landscaping do not themselves make for the encouragement of superior students. In the absence of a sound academic program, these things actually stand in the way of achieving one. I would submit, then, that a danger to obtaining and maintaining any kind of academic program lies in the tremendous emphasis on physical facilities that are built at the expense of and in lieu of the improvement of the academic program. Important as physical facilities are, no one must fall into the trap of confusing them with the greater importance of a strong educational program which would, of course, include adequate and, if possible, excellent physical facilities.

But, it can be argued, all the public funds for the improvement of Negro colleges are not expended on buildings, swimming pools, sunken gardens, and recreation halls. Look at the amount that is being spent on salaries. It is true that the salaries of teachers, and especially college teachers, have greatly improved in the last decade. This is a happy and significant development, and the move is almost universally applauded. But it does not necessarily contribute to the improvement of the intellectual climate of the college community. There is great pressure on the president of every public institution of higher education for Negroes to secure and maintain accreditation for the institution. An important consideration is, of course, the faculty, especially the formal training of the faculty. The president is obliged to go out and recruit highly trained teachers, more specifically Ph.D.'s, in order to secure accredition. Most of them are required to restrict their recruiting to Negroes. Thus they must build a college for Negroes that is equal to the college for whites, but in building a faculty they must confine their recruiting to Negroes whose academic and intellectual disadvantage has made it possible for only a limited number to secure the Ph.D. degree. A ludicrous situation ensues. A young Negro receives his Ph.D. from the university of X in June. A Negro college president hears about it. He flies up to the university to make the budding scholar an offer. He has other offers and, in the enjoyment of a sellers market, he is successful in securing rank and salary completely out of line with his experience and standing in his profession. He joins the select company of Negro scholars who are actually insufficient to staff the Negro colleges, and he becomes the central figure in the tug-of-war as the presidents begin the battle for his services. He is an extraordinarily sober and prudent young professor if, in the midst of such goings-on, he keeps his attention focussed on the problems that are primarily academic, including the identification and encouragement of superior students.

There is one other major consideration that constitutes an important factor in the status of scholarship in the Negro school and college. It has to do with the growing awareness on the part of the young Negro student of his status and his increasing concern with it. A course in, say, American institutions and values, or one even in American history well taught, starts even a slow Negro student to begin considering his own situation and it doubtless puts a bright young Negro on edge. Freedom, equality, democracy, tolerance, enfranchisement, participation. All these things suddenly begin to take on some specific meaning to him and he begins to see himself in a new and different light. At best it is distracting. At worst it is traumatic. In any case it starts him thinking about himself and the society that does certain things to him, and he is drawn, to some extent, from his main scholarly activities. Perhaps he just *thinks* and gives to this matter thought that should be given to his main pursuit. But, perhaps, he is so oppressed by the very contemplation of his degraded status that he turns much of his attention to it. It could be a W.E.B. Du Bois who fretted over it and then turned from his main intellectual interests to devote seventy years to a struggle that ended in despair and disillusionment. It could be a North Carolina student perched on a stool at a lunch counter in a five and ten cents store where he could not eat who would then spend five, ten, years—perhaps his life, perhaps give his life—in the effort to discover himself in relation to the society of which he was a part.

These observations seem to suggest that if the problem of the discovery and encouragement of the academically talented in the United States is, under ordinary conditions, a difficult and complex one, it is especially difficult and incredibly complex where Negroes are concerned. It would seem that any effort looking to the planning and maintaining programs for superior Negro students must be mindful of these difficulties and complexities. The first task of those responsible for such programs is to reject any notion that physical facilities, including the country club trappings, can ever provide an acceptable substitute for a sound academic program. This is more difficult for public institutions than for private ones; but in the world of values that affect students wherever they are, it is difficult in both kinds. Another task, one that lies especially heavy on the mind and conscience of the teacher in a Negro institution, whether he be Negro or white, is to make certain at all times that the ideals of scholarship and excellence are not obscured by the necessary effort to secure adequate remuneration for one's own services. Finally, there is the extremely difficult task of reconciling the grave problems that confront any Negro student today. He must try to achieve some respectable status in the community and, at the same time, keep his sights on the ideal of excellence and superiority in the field of scholarship.

These tasks will differ from college to college, from state to state, from public institution to private institution, and so on. These differences do not, however, obscure their existence. They do exist, and they cannot be wished away or ignored. If America would remain strong, if she is to utilize with efficiency her great resources and realize her enormous potential, programs to utilize the talents of *all* her citizens must be developed and maintained. The young Negro genius, if he knew himself, would cry out to his country to utilize his talents for the enhancement of the position of his country. He has neither the voice nor the understanding to assert himself. That is the responsibility that we must assume. If we do, there will, in due time, rise up among us new giants in the land, strong in mind and heart, and dedicated to achieving for the benefit of everyone the things they had found it almost impossible to achieve.

THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL FACTORS ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Horace Mann Bond
Dean, Atlanta University

With all of the troubles that persist around us, I think we may here today take some pleasure in the thought that the human race is closer, as evidenced by this Conference, to the realization of the Ideal State, than at any time since Plato described it in the fourth century before Christ.

> "Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never rest from their evils, — no, nor the human race, as I believe, — and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day."

That quotation is taken from the Fifth Book of *The Republic*: I enter it on our record as a good book for counsellors to read; it is available in a 95c Modern Library Paperback edition. I differ with Plato, it is true, in his advocacy of a Republic ruled by the superior men of the Society; he had no faith in democracy, or rule by the "commoner natures". I can afford to differ with him, for one reason, because I speak in a state where once the great political slogan was,

"Let Every Man be a King!"

and I take it, that you agree with me, that the function of guidance counsellors is to see to it, that we develop a state where every man will be a philosopher, where every philosopher is a king, and every king, a philosopher. Even if you do not agree with me, I want to declare unequivocally, that this is the platform on which I stand, the framework in which I shall cast my remarks for the subject, "The Influence of Cultural Factors on Academic Achievement".

I repeat that the current social order is one of the first in human history to come in fact to the verge of giving the highest value to the philosopher ideal, to the man best fitted in academic performance, to the philosopher-king. There have been other cultures, it is true, in which long strides were taken toward giving the good student his proper place in the society. During thousands of years, the ancient Chinese took long steps toward creating such a society; it was, perhaps, the lack of the dynamics of modern energy utilization, that set limits to the role of the student, and to the society in which he operated as a ruler, among the Chinese.

The Hebrews, likewise, venerated the wise man; here the lesson of the danger of a theocratic state, combined with a non-dynamic utilization of power, fits the moral first learned from ancient China. The Greeks honored the idea among their philosophers, but never in the structure of government. The British, in two or three centuries, carried it far, through their Civil Service, dominated by university trained men who had won highest distinction within the university; and whose academic competence had to be exceptional in order to gain a place in the administrative machinery of that admirable Civil Service. Given a continuation of Empire, and an absence of war, the extended Empire might have brought that system to Plato's consummation, or even that of Huey Long's, in another several hundreds of years.

The development toward the philosopher-ruled state has taken another direction. It suddenly dawned upon the secular rulers of mankind, that the giant, technology, might reproduce his kind with enormous rapidity, if given proper conditions for his growth, and generative abilities. during wartime, all restraints were cast off, that had hindered this development; and so, equally the British, the Americans, and the Russians, channelled the energies of learned men of science into the war-needed directions and gave them every propulsion that the economy could provide, in funds, in materials, and facilities.

After a decade, or so, of this new discovery (and our own, American demonstration of what thus could be done, in Oak Ridge, and at Los Alamos, was not the least of the persuaders), the apparition of Sputnik I in the skies cast what has so far been the final die, in the determination of the future direction of educational and social endeavour. Our own atom bomb had been heralded as the work of genius; genius from Germany, genius from Italy, genius sometimes home-grown. The achievements of the Russians, likewise, were heralded as the work of genius; genius this time the more surprising, because our prejudiced myopia had always viewed Russia as a backward land of darkness, of underdeveloped educational institutions, and even more, underdeveloped minds, or minds even incapable of development.

Trying to explain the mystery by which these backward people had so exceeded our own attainments in the conquest of space, we found no better explanation, than that there must be some kind of magic in the educational system through which, it was assumed, these unexpected works of genius had come. Of course, one prior preconception entered in: it was the conception that in most populations, there were exceptionally gifted individuals, born, so to speak, to the "manor of the philosopher"; persons whose genetic constitution—whose neural organization, brain size, or what have you—equipped them from birth to great feats of abstract thought, of dazzling flights with figures, and with the manipulation of formulae.

We were even more impressed with what we thought the Russians had done, by way of contriving a fearsome educational system, because we had before so low an opinion of the Russian level of ability. To have produced these devilish genius that hurled Sputnik into the skies, from such a population, meant to a great many Americans, that the Communists had discovered the ultimate in educational theory and practice.

It is my purpose to examine the influence of the various factors in the development of able students; but principally, to examine the influence of cultural factors on academic performance. Such an examination may help us approach both the tasks that face us at this Conference, and also, the grand design of Plato's State, to be ruled by philosophers in the guise of kings; and even Huey Long's sloganed world, where every man was to be a king in his own right.

II

I said we would examine the factors involved in the production of persons of unusual academic performance. In all of the ages during which men have examined this problem, they have agreed that two great groups of factors are involved; genetic, — biological inheritance; and cultural — social influences, social inheritance.

Indeed, the great majority of opinion, scarcely ever questioned, assigned to biological inheritance the most important, if not the only role, in the appearance of unusual ability. Although it now seems so securely founded on "scientific" principles, this unquestioning acceptance of a conviction in retrospect seems more like a dogma, born of the oldest superstitions. For were not the blessed of the ancients the bastard children of the Gods, themselves? The men who towered over their fellows, whether in physique, or in brains, were indubitably to be explained by their descent from the playful sporting of the Gods and Goddesses of Olympus with mortal men.

Something of this is to be found in Plato, himself; and in his talk of "men of the commoner natures", "men of clay", "men of brass", "men of silver", "men of gold". But it took that scientific age, the mid-nineteenth century, to lay a foundation in the infant days of evolutionary faith for belief in the transmission, as a natural physical and biological phenomenon, of the traits that enable men to excel in human competitions.

The man who made this essay, greatly successful in his day, was Sir Francis Galton, who, in 1869, published his work, *Hereditary Genius,* and in 1874, *British Men of Science.* Looking backward, we can see that Galton was reporting on the obvious; at that time, it seemed that he had given scientific justification: thus men held their positions at the top of every heap because their native constitution entitled them to do so, as kings held their positions in a Victorian world because God had so ordained it that they should.

Galton reported that there was a strong tendency—strong to the point of absolute proof, in his mind and the minds of most of his readers—for scientific, and other ability, to "run in the family." His accumulation of data showing distinguished sons of distinguished fathers, grandfathers, and even more remote ancestors of whole families of "geniuses", brothers, sisters, cousins, nephews, nieces and other consanguineous relations seemed to reduce what he called the "science of Eugenics" to a simple demonstration of obvious fact. Indeed, one wondered only that no one had thought of it before.

In our own country, the new "science" caught on at once; it had an immense acceleration after the publication of Goddard's famous comparison of the Jukes and Kallikak families. You recall it: time was when every school boy was taught the tale; and having been taught, duly believed, how Martin Kallikak, a decent young man himself, but proven to sow his wild oats, had an illegitimate child by an obviously deprived and feeble-minded Jukes girl. Then Martin Kallikak went off to fight for the liberty of his country, in the war of the Revolution. After the war, he returned, to marry decently as was his family habit, and, by his lawfully wedded wife, proceeded to father a large, sturdy, and decent family. His children's children, and their children's children, on to the sixth generation to follow Martin, were paragons of virtue, industry, sturdiness, and intelligence.

But it was not so with the descendants of Martin Kallikak by his illegimate child by the Jukes girl. Unworthy of his name, her children, and her children's children, carried the name of Jukes into every record of delinquent behavior kept by the community. Where the Kallikaks were virtuous, the Jukes were prostitutes, charity girls, and families of such persons, producing illegitimate children in endless profusion.

Where the Kallikaks were industrious, the Jukes were lazy, shiftless, improvident. Where the Kallikaks were sturdy, the Jukes exhibited every variety of physical and mental disease. Where the Kallikaks were soundly intelligent, the Jukes bred hosts of the feeble-minded, the insane, and otherwise afflicted.

Goddard's genealogical tables were so precise, so regular in their story, that everyone who saw them believed; at least I did. At this time, Gregory Mendel's mid-century investigations of heredity in peas had been re-discovered less than twenty years before, and had hurriedly been rushed into the textbooks, but like a great many others, Mendel and Galton and the sweet peas and the "science" of genetics were to me a new-found gospel: the more convincing, because in a flash, all of the problems of human differences were solved. Indeed the riddle of my own life was solved. I was a pretty smart fellow, because I was the child of pretty smart parents and grand-parents—and not only I, but the whole dazzling future of the Bond clan was assured.

I believed this gospel, just long enough to enable me to graduate from college, enter the University of Chicago, and one day attend a lecture by the wicked man, W. L. Thomas, who, not too long before, had been fired from the University of Chicago faculty because, it was said, he had carried on his searching investigations of the Polish immigrant peasant a trifle farther than propriety required in a professor of sociology, interviewing pretty Polish subjects in the solitude of a Chicago hotel room.

But I remember, today, what W. L. Thomas said in his lecture. You do not, he said, inherit the language, you have to learn it. The language, he continued, carries the culture, and as you cannot inherit the language, you cannot possibly inherit the culture, and all that goes with it.

He went further. He cited the Jukes and the Kallikaks; said W. L. Thomas, it would have been a much more convincing sociological experiment if Martin Kallikak had fathered the illegitimate child of the intelligent girl, and married the feeble-minded girl.

It was a great lesson in what I think is the essence of the scientific attitude, especially as it concerns the social aspects of the human animal. Things, it seemed, are *never* as they seem to be; and even the gospel of Eugenics, as preached by Galton and by Goddard, could not withstand the healthy scepticism of W. L. Thomas.

I do not come here with the negative aim of destroying faith—faith is, without doubt, a wonderful quality. I do want to suggest that almost everything taken for granted about human beings, about what we call "Human Nature", may be wrong, so uncertain is our knowledge, so complicated is the problem, so immature is the state of the "science" with which we approach that profound and immeasurably intricate complex that is man, reacting to the physical and social world.

I wish now, then, to approach the question of human ability, and that of academic performance, from a non-genetic direction: that of the cultural factors involved. What is the culture? What are cultural factors? Why, the culture is all that summons us, that was made by man, reacting to other men, and to his physical world. We learn the culture through our senses, but particularly through the language. I announce in advance, the theme of this examination: it is, that we do not inherit the culture, we do not inherit the language; we must learn the culture, we must learn the language.

Here I wish to give some examples of what may be called cultural factors in performance: in general, and in academic performance.

Let us take Galton's own examples: the examples of "*Hereditary Genius*" he drew from literary and political and scientific circles in England of his time; the examples of "*British Men of Science*" he drew from the world he knew.

The display shows an amazing intertwining of familial stocks; the great literary figures of England then, as now, may be seen to be also, literary families; and the great figures of science in Britain in 1874—the date of publication of his book on the subject—are shown to be closely inter-related. The same conclusions might be drawn today; with Aldous Huxley, son of Thomas Huxley, the popularizer of Darwin's doctrines, one of the great English literary figures; with his brother, another Huxley, noted throughout the world as a great biologist; and with their cousin, Elspeth Huxley, renowned for her literary skill.

For the purpose of this essay, let us remember that one advantage is that studies of the kind that Galton conducted cut both ways. The environmentalist may take precisely the same figures, and use them for his own purposes; in this instance, to show that the pre-eminence of related lines in eighteenth century England was but an example of the closest-knit hierarchy of an upper class system ever devised by the mind of man.

Similar, are the studies of Sorokin, the Russian exile who came to Harvard not long after the Revolution, and there pursued his studies that had been designed to show the primacy in ability of the Russian and European elite. While yet in Russia, Sorokin inspired numerous studies of European elites. His Russian student, Philiptschenko, found that scholars of that country came from agriculture in 8% and from labor in 2.7% of all cases. Men of letters came from each of these classes in 9.6% of the total number. Great contemporary scientists came from agriculture in 14.1% of the cases and from laborers (including peasants) in 3.5% of the cases. All of the rest came from the upper classes. In the period covered, not less than 85% of the Russian people lived in rural areas.

Another of Sorokin's students, Maas, in Germany, reported the social origins of German scientists born after 1700, and dying before 1900. Less than a quarter of these scientists were derived from the lower classes. The greater number came as one might expect from the lower classes.

A study of great mathematicians shows the same class origin; principally from the upper classes, and particularly from families where there had been some exposure to simple and complex manipulation of figures, such as the families of merchants, professors of mathematics, and such other persons as deal habitually in calculations.

The studies of American scholars conducted by Cattell show the same tendency; scholars are likely to come from the homes of scholars, professors, from professional homes; great scientists from the homes of people whose daily life has been, in some way, impinged upon by science.

One of the most intriguing examples of such an analysis is that of the social origin of Russian scholars. We have referred, above, to the hysteria that has spread over America since the Russians showed they had almost the malevolent genius, as to be able to surpass us in projecting Sputnik into the skies. I have also referred to the equal hysteria that ascribed a supposed Russian genius for devising a new educational system to the men who had engineered this miracle.

An examination of the reality shows this to be far from the truth. In 1957, when Sputnik first appeared in the sky, the Russian newspaper, *Pravda*, shortly thereafter printed the names of thirty-one Soviet scientists whom they credited with the miracle. I have examined the background of these people, as well as one may from the Great Russian Encyclopedia, and other sources. Because their theory is utter equality, and a denial of any social class, Russians are extremely reticent about familial origins and occupations.

Yet, from what we can glean, these factors are self-evident:

1. Practically all of the Russian scientists cited by *Pravda*, as having been responsible for the development of Sputnik, were born and educated through at least the primary and secondary stages, before the Russian Revolution transpired in 1917, and even received their university education long before the Communists fully put into effect their control of education in Russia.

   As two specific examples: one of the geniuses of the Russian nuclear fission development is Dr. Kapitsa. This man was twenty years old when the Revolution transpired; he was the son of a Czarist General of the Engineer Corps; and the Russian genius, after finishing Czarist schools, received his graduate education at Cambridge University in England.

> Last week, the New York *Times* carried the account of the death of Kurchatov, the man credited with the development of the Russian Hydrogen bomb. We learned that Kurchatov was born in 1896; he was twenty-one years old when the Revolution in Russia took place; he had graduated from the University of Kazan in 1921, when the Communists were still in the midst of their civil war to assert final control over Russia, and by no means may he be claimed as a product of Russian, Revolutionary, Communist genius.

Now let me turn to the influence of cultural influences on academic influences in another corner of the world.

I have previously referred to the Jews, as among the first people in the entire world who early in human civilization—some four thousand years ago, which means some forty centuries, which in turn means some 120 generations—developed a culture that respected and exalted learning.

I have in my possession a fascinating study of some of the current problems of education in Israel. Chief of these appears to be, that the policy of ingesting Jews from everywhere has now reached the point where Western Jews are outnumbered; it is estimated that almost 80% of the Jews in Israel are now what are called Oriental Jews; that is, Jews from the Arab countries, and from North Africa. Formerly, politics and education in Israel were dominated by the westernized Jews from Europe; victims of Hitler's almost unthinkable atrocities. But as the Jews from Morocco, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Tunis, Algeria, Egypt, and Morocco have come in, Israel has found itself plagued both with a "color question" (the Jews from these other countries were dark in complexion), and with an educational problem. The "Oriental Jews" were "backward"; a study was even made of their intelligence quotients.

I quote from that study:

> "The question of innate intellectual capacities was tackled by an interesting study of IQ's. Jewish immigrants from Iraq and Western Jewish immi-

> grants from Rumania were chosen for comparison because in both these countries Jews were represented at all levels of economic life, from professional to unskilled. Matched samples of children were tested and their IQ's compared. The results showed a positive correlation between the occupational status of a family and a child's I.Q., not between ethnic background and IQ. Because of higher standards in Rumania, occupation for occupation the Rumanian children's scores were roughly 10% higher in all categories; otherwise, there was a comparable stepdown from professional to business to skilled to unskilled for both groups. Several studies on the different results of education and social experiences were merely listed by Dr. Smilensky . . ."

It was found that "as a whole, the Oriental children have not been doing well in school and many teachers have been overwhelmed by the difficulties they were meeting. People have begun to think and talk about the intellectual inferiority, as well as the poor academic grades, of the Oriental Jews as a group. Again and again it has been reported that the children of Oriental immigrant families have great difficulty in thinking abstractly, in relating concrete facts and generalizations in learning some subjects."

I have quoted here at length, because these new studies sound precisely like the majority of studies made of American Negroes during the last fifty years, by means of "intelligence tests", as contrasted with white children in general; and between Southern Negro and Southern white children; Southern Negro and Northern Negro children; and racial comparisons in general. The Negro children, the older studies insist — I cite the late Professor Petersen, of Peabody Teachers College—were backward in what he called "rational learning". They could not, he said, master "abstract reasoning".

I could cite numerous other studies of intelligence and achievement tests, that more than strangely resemble the studies made in Israel that compare Western and Oriental Jews. One of my favorite examples is the National Merit Scholarship Competition: one of the most exquisite examples imaginable of the influence of cultural factors on one type of academic performance.

Distressed, some years ago, to note that on the published lists I could find no child from one of the Southern Negro, and Northern high schools I knew to be predominantly Negro, I began an analysis of these results by plotting them geographically by county, and city ward of residence. I took a particular interest in the state of Kentucky, where I lived as a child; and the city of Chicago, where I studied, and that I knew better than I did any other American city.

This little exercise I published under the title, "Talents—and Toilets" (Winter, 1959, *Journal of Negro Education*). It served no useful purpose, except, perhaps, to make Director Stalnaker of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation furious. For I worked out a ratio between the percentage of houses equipped with indoor toilets and running water, and the ratio of the National Merit Scholars and certificate winners, by counties and congressional districts, to the percentage of houses so equipped.

In Kentucky, for example, in the 8th Congressional District—a Mountain District—only 13% of the houses have inside toilets. The District, likewise, contributed no National Merit Scholars or Certificate winners to the lists for that state, in 1956. By contrast, Jefferson County, Kentucky—which is practically contiguous with the city of Louisville and its suburbs—had, in 1956, more than 50% of all the National Merit Scholars and certificate winners in the state.

If you plot this distribution in the city of Chicago, you find the same phenomenon; few toilets per family, few scholars; many toilets per family, many scholars. The map shows a heavy spotting of scholars and certificate winners in Chicago's northside "Gold Coast", in Oak Park, River Forest, and the suburban areas of the North and Northwest, around Evanston, and in the uppermiddle class Jewish area on the lake front around 75th street in the South. But there are none in Congressman Dawson's 1st Congressional District—the "Loop" and Black Belt District running from the Chicago River to 43rd street, on the South; nor in the 5th and 7th Congressional Districts, that include "Back of the Yards" and the road to Cicero, areas heavily populated by stock-yard workers, and the first and second generation immigrants from Southeastern Europe.

Further, I broke down the proportions the occupational classes of the parents of the winners in 1956 were to the proportions those classes were in the United States occupational census for 1950. Such an analysis shows that the child of a professional father has astronomical odds in his favor, in competing for a National Merit Scholarship against the child of a laborer, or one of the other lower occupational classes. The children of ministers, architects, engineers, physicians, and lawyers have from 1500 to 2000 times a better chance of winning this competition than the children of the lower occupational groups; and by "lower" I take the classification used by the United States Census. One striking fact was that two of the 518 scholars, in 1956, were listed as the children of librarians. In 1950 there were only 6,390 male librarians classified in the United States Census; but this small number produced twice as many National Merit Scholars as did 3,581,370 laborers enumerated in 1950.

What I found was, of course, what one might expect. High or low scores on the National Merit Scholarship Examinations have nothing to do with race. By and large, Negro candidates do not win these competitions; they score too poorly. Neither do poor mountain whites; nor the children of white persons living in urban slums. The tests administered by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation are a clear and simple measure of the culture; quite probably, also, they are clear and simple measures of the possibility for high academic performance—at the time they are administered, and for standard populations; "standard" meaning, those populations exposed to the standard American social and cultural experience.

Likewise, with every other test ever administered; with every comparative survey made. I believe every counsellor of underprivileged populations of children should possess, as one of his Bibles, the study of environmental factors in learning published in 1952 by the Chicago team that included Eels, Havinghurst, Davis, Tyler, and others. This study of Rockford, Illinois, measured the social status of the schools of that city, and correlated performance in academic tests with their highly useful "Index of Social Status Characteristics". There resulted a graph showing the ladder-like arrangement of the schools in the social status scale, from lower-lower, to upper-upper.

Three years ago, a similar survey was published in Atlanta, Georgia. The study arranges the 97 elementary schools of Atlanta in descending order of attainment in standard achievement tests. In each test—reading, arithmetic, and in each grade tested—the medians of the white distribution show a commanding advantage for the white schools. At the top of the distribution are the majority of the white schools; at the bottom, the majority of the Negro schools.

But there are two highly significant features of these Atlanta distributions. Despite the apparent "racial" differences when one inspects these graphs, it is a fact that there are some white schools that test lower than some Negro schools. Furthermore, the ranges show that in almost every Negro school in the city, there is at least one Negro child—and frequently more— who scores at or above the median of the highest white school.

The distribution looks curiously like that of the Rockford, Illinois, study; the identity of the schools is hidden; but by questioning, here and there, one can find out roughly the location of the high scoring, and low scoring schools, for each racial distribution. It develops, that the top nine white schools are top in every test; and that they are located in that upper-middle class section of Atlanta known as Buckhead. The low-scoring white schools turn out to be located in, or contiguous to, the low-cost housing projects, or the twilight zone of slum clearance projects. All in all, it is a beautiful example of the effect of cultural factors on a kind of academic performance.

IV

Let me now briefly review what I have tried to say.

First, that historically there have been few cultures that attached value to the good student.

Second, that it has been taken for granted, especially since the rise of "scientific" theories of evolution, that the able student was the product of genetic factors.

Third, that any analysis of able students, as measured by standard tests, or even by actual academic performance in college and graduate school (and afterward), will show that a great preponderance of the so-called "gifted" are from upper-class homes. This has been a historic fact in all cultures; and it still persists even in that recently vaunted culture—that of the Soviet, Communist State, where the great scientists of Communist Russia today—far from being the products of the new Communist system—are in fact the children of university professors, of highly skilled and trained technicians and professionals of the old order and of the immense bureaucracy the Czarist regime had before Lenin began, in 1917, to try to organize the Socialist State.

But these findings do not satisfy; that is, unless we are content to resign ourselves to a continually self-perpetuating class system. The genius of the American State is, after all, that of the theory of human equalitarianism. Provoked to some kind of action by appearances of Soviet superiority, one solution would be to follow the advice of Dr. Teller, and Admiral Rickover, and to do what the Russians have actually done.

For, on examination, you will find that the communists in the end invented no new educational mechanisms. Rather, they adopted the form and organization of education as organized in Western Europe during the last five hundred years; as they did when Peter the Great began his efforts to reorganize the Russian community, three hundred years ago. The system in Austria and Germany and Switzerland had been a class system, with the gymnasium beginning the separation of those future prospects for intellectual and professional studies. The Russian Middle School was turned to the same design; characterized by rigid discipline, sharp selection, and the highest standards for the class designed to be an elite.

It is true that it was loudly proclaimed that the new Soviet educational ladder—in contrast to that of the bourgeois West—was to be open to the children of the proletariat. But the effect of the culture is such that one can destroy the inheritance of literacy. Hence, I strongly suspect that the Russian intellectual elite is now derivative from precisely those classes of the population from which, historically, all such elites have always been derived in Western nations; and that the proportion of the children of laborers in Russian universities is no higher than it was in Czarist days, and probably is lower. What we see emerging is indeed what Djilas calls, *The New Class*; where the professional communists—the politicians—are obliged to call upon the technicians to run the apparatus of a modern State; and, in the process, see their children floundering in competition with the more highly dowered children of the newest of all classes—the technicians and professionals in a State sworn to the principle of the domination of the proletariat.

How all of this will turn out, no one now can say. You may have noted that, in the last proposed five-year budget for the USSR, one of the significant educational items was the provision of large sums for boarding schools. I believe this recommendation is a recognition, in the USSR, that ordinary procedures will not meet the grand design of giving every proletarian child in the Soviet Union an equal chance to get ahead, and aspire to membership in the intellectual elite; that even now, after forty years of the Revolution, and a system of housing and salary bonuses for technical and professional workers, the favored children are those who grow up in families favored with literacy and superior education; and that the only conceivable way to equalize opportunity for the children from non-literate, or newly literate families is to take them out of their partially illiterate community and family associations as soon as possible, and give them the advantages of a wholly literate environment, as can be provided, for such children, only in a contrived, boarding school environment.

V

As a final illustration of the effect of cultural factors on academic performance, let me refer briefly to a study I have in progress, with the cooperative assistance of the Office of Education, entitled, "A Study of the Factors Involved in the Identification and Encouragement of Persons of Unusual Academic Promise among Underprivileged Population." My subjects are Negroes who have earned academic doctorates. I do not say that they are "talented"; I do say that they have been good students.

From the 500 or so life histories I have so far been able to accumulate, I can justly claim to have found some fascinating records. The study as such is incomplete and I am not at liberty to announce or publish any findings. But some of the material was collected before the formal study began, and I can refer to this data.

There are old and notable families—like the Daniel's, of Virginia, who have produced five siblings who earned doctorates; like the Colson's, also of Virginia, who have a well-documented family history going back to 1742; like Robert Weaver, whose father was a representative of the Negroes who got at least a minor place in the civil service, and was a member of Washington's Negro "elite", holding similar positions a generation ago; and, in this state*, the Harrison's, and the Barker's, children of school teachers, from families well disciplined, well educated.

But with all respect to these highly capable, proven scholars, the ones in my sample that interest me are those who literally "came from nowhere". My prize example is Colonel Hildrus A. Poindexter, without doubt one of the top three or four experts in tropical medicine in the world.

Poindexter is the son of a share-cropper from Shelby County, Tennessee, who never had any formal education to speak of. His mother finished approximately the third grade. Poindexter himself attended the four or five months terms of a rural school in Shelby County. At the age of 14, when he finished the eighth grade, a Presbyterian minister-teacher in the community saw a great deal of promise in the boy and urged him to leave the community to enter the

---

* Louisiana

Swift Memorial Institute in East Tennessee.

Poindexter did and, supporting himself by prodigies of labor and study, finished the high school course. His usual schedule was: arise at 4:30 a.m.; study; walk to the town and build fires in the home of a wealthy white family; walk back to the school for his breakfast; at 3:00 p.m., and as janitor, tidy up a local bank; at 5:30 p.m., walk back to the school for dinner; then, study until 10:00 p.m.; then, bank the fires in the girl's dormitory; then, after more study, to bed.

He went on to Lincoln University, supporting himself by various jobs in school term, and as a Pullman porter during the summer. Graduating with honors in 3½ years—the first student ever to be permitted to do so at this college, and then only because, unnoticed by the Faculty, he had been carrying 19 and 20 hour loads each semester—he entered the two-year Darmouth College Medical School; finished this course with distinction, and went on to Harvard Medical College, again to finish with honors. Later, he took the Ph.D. in Parasitology at Columbia.

Since then, Poindexter has taught at Howard University, but principally has been on research and action programs for the United States Public Health Service. In World War II, he won a presidential citation for reducing the malaria rate for American military and naval personnel in the South Pacific, within six months of being placed in charge of malaria prevention. He has served in Liberia; was called upon to screen the 800,000 refugees from North Vietnam for health purposes, and establish a health program for them; has been borrowed by the Dutch Government for service in Dutch Guiana, and by the Iraqui Government for service there, at a time when Americans in government were not too popular; and currently, is on assignment in Libya in North Africa. In 1956 Dartmouth College gave him the honorary degree of D.Sc. The citation stated that few, if any men, had ever had the opportunities Poindexter had, for saving human life on a vast scale, and that no one had ever done better with the opportunities presented.

As to tests—(and I have permission from Poindexter to make this statement)—I have the record of the Old Thurston test administered to Poindexter's Lincoln University class in 1920. One other member of that class later took his doctorate; this was Robert S. Jason, M.D. from Howard, Ph.D. in Pathology from Chicago, now head of the Medical School at Howard University.

In that test, Poindexter was 33rd from the top in a class of 79; Jason was 43rd. In writing them for permission to report that status, I tried a jest: I said, "You boys did so poorly on this test, because you both came from foreign language countries": Jason, from Spanish-speaking Puerto Rico; and Poindexter, from a cotton farm in Shelby County, Tennessee. By national percentiles, Poindexter was at the 15th percentile compared to American college freshmen; Jason at the 8th percentile.

These men are not exceptional, so far as the reliability of standard tests are concerned in predicting the possible future success of persons from underprivileged populations in graduate and professional studies. The manual of the MCAT — Medical College Admission Test — warns those using them to attach no significance to the test scores of foreign students; or even, of the children of Americans, who have been reared abroad.

I think the same caution is exactly *a propos*, in the interpretation of test scores for Negroes generally; and, indeed, of other underprivileged Americans. The apparently low score may mask the true competitive ability of the student. I have come to believe, that a simple rule of thumb should be applied to the test performance of such persons, in estimating their probable competitive capacity in studying material that is fairly new (as graduate and professional studies may well be).

That rule is, that to determine whether the Negro can compete, add, arbitrarily, from 20 to 25 percentile points to the percentile rank he attained on the basis of national standards. One should further examine the occupational and educational status of the parents. If the parents were well educated, professional persons, reduce the "deprivation bonus"; if they were uneducated, in the lower occupational brackets, increase the "deprivation bonus". I wish only that this procedure could be established with a greater statistical precision than I can now attempt.

Let me conclude. In a Conference such as this, one is always torn between the duty of the student—which is to examine the truth and report it, and the other duty of the reformer, which is, after examining the truth, to try to do something about it.

I regret to say that I have no simple formula for action, as the truth rests on an extremely complicated set of factors.

I do point out what a St. Louis principal, Sheppard, is doing to increase substantially the scores attained by the students in the public schools of the community where he is a supervisor. He enlisted the interest and cooperation of the community. He organized study, at home and in the school, as a cooperative enterprise; he made parents, teachers, and children, acutely aware of their poor showing in comparative test surveys.

This means, simply, that this man has made the school an effective instrument for teaching. This cannot be said for the vast majority of schools enrolling underprivileged children. The task is heroic; it is no less a one than combating the influence of the different, nonstandard world, in which these underpriviledged children live, and learn—principally learning what the standard test, and the standard school, have to "unlearn".

I think it can be done. Perhaps it is nostalgia; but I recall, in person, the character of the instruction in the mission schools once conducted throughout the South. One of the suggestive aspects of my study of the academically able, is the pattern that appears when one superimposes a map showing the childhood residence of the parents and grandparents of my Negro doctorates on a map showing the location of those early mission schools. The parents and grand-parents of my subjects tend to cluster in certain counties; and these are the counties where the best of the old mission schools were located. The clusters are in such areas as the fringe of counties in Louisiana and Mississippi, bordering the old "Florida Parishes" line. Is it accidental that the Prentiss Institute was located in this area?—or does the explanation lie in the character of a population that after the Civil War "homesteaded" the large tracts of "free" government land in this area, thus laying the groundwork for an unusually high percentage of individual family land ownership in a Negro rural population?

A principal cluster is Perry County, Alabama. In this Black Belt county, there were large clusters of Negro landowners, although generally the percentage of land-ownership among Negroes was low. But in distinction to hundreds of similar counties in the South — where no parents or grandparents of future Negro doctorates lived—there was, at Marion, the excellent American Missionary School, the Lincoln Normal School.

There are other such counties: Richland County in South Carolina, where Benedict College, and Allen University early sent their graduates into the schools of the surrounding countryside; Dinwiddie County in Virginia, where Professor Colson brought his Dartmouth diploma and Phi Beta Kappa key in 1876 to the school that became the Dinwiddie County Training School, and a veritable cradle for parents and grand-parents of present Negro doctorates, and for doctorates themselves; and Madison County, Kentucky, the home of the Berea College that enrolled Negroes up to 1907.

Seeing this, I conclude by admitting the enormous strength of cultural factors in affecting academic performance; but also, by recognizing the enormous importance a good school may have in affecting academic performance, to more generations than we can now count. The Post-Civil War mission schools did it; Sheppard, in St. Louis, is doing it in a Negro slum; Southern University, Morgan State College, and other institutions are doing it today, as you may read when Sinclair Price's study for the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, that is now in preparation, is printed.

We can all do it; and we must do it.

IDENTIFYING AND MOTIVATING THE TALENTED AMONG THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED

Bruce Shertzer
Project on Guidance and Motivation of
Superior and Talented Students

North Central Association of Colleges
and Secondary Schools

The North Central Association's Project on Guidance and Motivation of Superior and Talented Students operates through a grant provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. One hundred comprehensive high schools within the 19 state area of the NCA were selected as pilot schools for the Project.

The purpose of the STS Project is to identify the superior and talented students (operationally defined as those students whose abilities place them in the top quarter of the population of the nation's schools), and to provide counseling and stimulation for such students so their educational and occupational choices will be more commensurate with their abilities. The programs in the 100 schools consist of (1) careful identification of superior students through tests of mental ability, achievement, aptitudes, teacher judgements, and past performances; (2) intensive counseling of these students; (3) making curricular adjustments for them; (4) utilizing motivational devices such as recognition of them in the school, community, service clubs, parent conferences; (5) maintenance of close home-school cooperation and support, and (6) inservice education for the professional staff. Through these programs it is expected that their levels of aspirations will be more nearly commensurate with their abilities, and that more of them will secure a formal education beyond the high school.

The three major hypotheses of the Project are that (1) faculties in the Project schools are capable of organizing an action program to develop and/or improve the provisions and practices to identify, guide and motivate superior and talented students, (2) the improvement of provisions for identifying, guiding, and motivating such students will be greater in Project schools than in Control schools, and (3) superior students in Project schools will be more motivated and better guided to make and proceed with appropriate educational and occupational plans than will comparable students in Control schools.

In the 100 schools approximately 30,000 students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 have been identified. Test data on them include results accruing from the administration of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development and Your Educational Plans, over a period of two years. A multitude of other information has been collected through eleven questionnaires and checklists covering such data as grades, subjects, counseling interviews, opinions and practices of teachers, counselors, administrators, parents and students.

Identifying Talent in Disadvantaged Groups. A great number of these 100 schools contain pupils from disadvantaged groups. The schools report great difficulties in identifying students from among the following groups: WASPS (White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, Southerns) who have moved to urban areas and have retained the cultural values of the community from which they came, Negroes, Spanish Americans, Indians, and other sub-cultural groups. We do not yet know whether all intellectual factors are equally affected by a deprived environment, nor to how great an extent the effects of early deprivation may be overcome by later plenty or by special techniques. The problem in identifying talented pupils reared in a seriously deprived environment is compounded because long continued deprivation reduces the potency of felt-needs for intellectual stimulation. Even if such stimulation is provided later, many individuals will no longer react to it. Also limitations in identifying talent may well from forces operative within the disadvantaged group if such a group perceives certain educational and occupational choices as safer in a sense of being likely to arouse little hostility in members of the majority group. Consequently, such students will not necessarily *identify themselves*, neither will they seek nor ask for recognition.

Many researchers have reported the limitations in using standardized tests as screening devices for talent in minority groups. They point out that youth from disadvantaged groups normally get "less favorable" scores, because such tests have been standardized for the most part on persons with middle-class backgrounds and mores. Perhaps greater success will be realized from the "culture fair" tests.

A technique used in some Project schools for identifying talented students among minority groups has been to first administer a standardized group test of mental abilities to all students in the school followed by the administration of an individual intelligence test, e.g., Standard Benet, to those students who score above a certain level on the group test. It was believed that this would yield a more accurate measure of the students' abilities and give school officials a better indication of the students' potentialities. Another method being used in some member schools has been the teacher use of structured checklists or inventories which list traits or characteristics of superior students. Schools have reported this method of identification has resulted in locating 5-10 additional students who would otherwise have been overlooked.

Motivation. In a very real sense whether or not individuals within a minority group achieve the highest level of which they are capable may be a function of the general attitudes of the group itself. Typically, the high school reflects a pattern of deferred gratification, higher level of aspiration, and an ideology that is primarily one of business rather than labor-socio-political. This is a hardship on working attitude standards, and may be one of the reasons why schools are on the whole less palatable to students from homes of lower socio-economic level.

Some of the practices used by Project schools to facilitate motivation of students toward academic pursuits include:

1. *Bringing into the school setting men and women who value education* and can serve as intellectual models. For able girls the need is to find models who embody high-level academic or intellectual attainment and feminity. For students from disadvantaged groups models must be well chosen otherwise they will remain remote, almost mystical figures, with no personal relevance.

2. *Making some attempts to substitute peer and adult models* where the YEP indicates a problem exists for talented students. This technique has possibilities if the counselors have the requisite competencies to perform it.

3. *Conducting several group meetings of parents to discuss the value* of further education and the school's efforts to identify and nurture talent. This permits discussion of their obligations and responsibilities toward these students.

4. *Using various practices to reward educational achievements.* Recognition is given to achievement of students throughout the school, in the community, in service clubs and professional organizations, and in the various media of communication.

5. *Providing some first-hand experiences with persons representing various occupations demanding talent.* This helps greatly, but by itself is not enough. The frequent discrepancy between aspiration or expectation and reality causes much frustration and unhappiness. It is difficult to provide in this way along any real understanding of the types of emotional settings and satisfactions incident in such jobs. Social realities change only slowly. More immediate change is possible in the other part of the inequality, in anticipation. What is needed is a realistic orientation toward: What can be expected from some intellectual activities? What kind of activities offer most of the satisfactions a particular individual wants?

6. *Developing a deliberate program to inform talented*

youth of the possibilities and advantages of education. This program should be continuous throughout the junior-senior high school years.

7. *Organizing a program of information regarding colleges, universities* and other opportunities for continuing education. This should be maintained by the guidance department of the school. These youth and their parents need information on financing a college education.

8. *Extending the schools' counseling services to include counseling services for parents of talented youth.* Planned individual conferences concerned with providing parents with information about the abilities, opportunities, and aspirations of their children has been of real assistance in encouraging talented students.

9. *Counseling directed to assisting girls to resolve the conflict of academic achievements and society's expectations of early marriage.* This is needed for two reasons: (1) the need for talented girls for self realization and (2) as educated mothers, their influence toward their own children's educational expectations would be of a facilitating nature.

10. *Keying our education to the development and encouragement of personal* independence rather than putting premiums on conformity and acceptance of facts and doctrines.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER IN DEVELOPING THE TALENTED OF THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED

HUEL D. PERKINS
Coordinator, Humanities Program
Southern University

"A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops," writes Henry Brooks Adams on teaching in *The Education of Henry Adams*. If such an all-pervasive statement can be intensified, then it is in the area of the teaching of the talented where we must seek its intensification. Talented students have a distinct role to play in the shaping of things to come. Individuals of superior abilities should be the leaders in all walks of life—for not only does the individual suffer when talent lies undiscovered or is not challenged to its maximum development, but society as well. Hence, the teacher of the talented, whether the talented of the culturally deprived or the culturally elite, assumes a delicate but far-reaching role—and certainly the teaching of these exceptional minds invites the services of those whose influence will likewise be exceptional—exceptionally proper.

America has need for talent as never before. This need, born of a growing concern for the future of this country in the area of world politics, can ill-afford to disparage exceptionality wherever it is to be found. J. Douglas Brown writing on "Curricular Adjustments for Talented Students" at Yale University sees the situation thusly: "If students with high potential are lost in the increased numbers of students flowing through our colleges, the product of education may be a nation of contented and capable followers with a shortage of vigorous and capable leaders." Still others view this problem of under-developed potential among persons of exceptional abilities in culturally deprived groups as the "unfinished business of education."

For the remainder of this exposition, it is assumed that the gifted student has reached college and is seriously entertaining the idea of the acquisition of a college degree. It is further assumed that this gifted student, due to specific problems, is not progressing in relation-ship to his capacity. Perhaps he is not applying himself to intellectual activities, or perhaps he is being called upon to really concentrate for the first time, or because of the variety of activities afforded by a college community he gives a disproportionate amount of his time to outside interests, or sees no value in doing well due to the absence of specific goals. Such a student, distinctly superior by all existing measuring devices, is offered up to the teacher for instruction. Here the role of the teacher begins.

A very valuable and necessary part of the teacher's equipment is a prior knowledge of some of the factors inhibiting maximum achievement usually associated with students coming from culturally deprived environments. The most obvious factors are: (1) insufficient motivation, (2) low degree of individual initiative, (3) low level of parental expectancy, and (4) apparent lack of relationship between what is being studied and an economically-satisfying future.

Insufficient motivation. The talented student of the culturally deprived usually enters college lacking proper inducement to make the most of his gifts. This problem is generated in part by the parents of the students who fail to encourage them by showing approval of learning and in part by the colleges which ofttimes fail to visibly reward exceptional intelligence. Hence, the talented student is reluctant in developing a positive attitude toward the importance of learning.

Low degree of individual initiative. This problem can be traced to many causes all the way from being the first of the family to reach college to the desire to become a "regular fellow" once at college. Many talented students are able to perform acceptably without extending themselves in relationship to their colleagues, which alone reduces initiative.

Low level of parental expectancy. Parents of talented persons in a culturally deprived group unwittingly inveigh against maximum development of their children by simply not expecting more of them in the way of significant achievement. In that the family does not impose goals which extend the capabilities of the student, the superior student is willing to settle for far less in the matter of academic achievement than his capability dictates.

Apparent lack of relationship between what is being studied and an economically satisfying future, or stated more succinctly, *a lack of effective orientation toward learning.* This problem revolves around value systems and the focusing of one's attention to learning for learning's sake. Put in different terms, it becomes a problem of the choice of a vocational curriculum as against a professional curriculum. The view which favors vocational preparation, usually of long-standing and supported by family and friends, is not easily changed, for the culturally deprived is also the economically deprived and that learning is important which is immediately marketable.

Ideally, a vigorous guidance program for talented students would to an appreciable extent reduce some of these deterring factors. However, the teacher, who has the advantage of extended contact hours with the student, becomes extremely effective in raising the level of achievement. To this end, the all-important job of teaching the superior student must not be left to chance—but should represent the most carefully chosen personnel assignments in the university. Teachers of gifted students should be chosen first of all for indices of being superior themselves. Whether these selections are arrived at by transcript examination, honor society memberships, appraisal of students and colleagues or other sources, the teacher of superior students should themselves be "Exhibit A" in the matter of superiority. By exhibiting superior abilities, a genuine enthusiasm for leading and desirable personal qualities, the teacher is able to lead his students to accept similar intellectual values.

Specifically, the teacher of the gifted student should be characterized by certain traits without which an instructor need not be entrusted to this important task. They are as follows:

Scholarship. The culturally deprived need teachers who themselves represent scholarship at its highest and best. The teacher should be one who delights in learning and is able to convey this delight to his students. He should consciously seek to create a climate wherein his students will *want* to learn. Scholarship in the teacher should be immediately recognizable by the students. They should discern this state of mind, this intelligence at work, this incessant inquiring and testing. A high degree of scholarship in a teacher, coupled with an intelligent approach to the business of learning can, in some cases, overcome the problem of insufficient motivation which plagues many students. To be sure, the desire to achieve and the motivation to learn are gradual developments, but instances do exist wherein a gifted student has had his sights raised by an interesting subject well-taught and an especially talented teacher who inspired him.

Dedication. A deep and abiding interest in the learning profession is a prime requisite. Aside from the fact that this trait is inspirational by its very nature, it clearly shows the integrity of the teacher. When the problem of individual initiative is encountered in the case of the talented, the dedicated and highly competent teacher is the one most likely to awaken in his students that "vision of greatness" which Whitehead claimed to be essential to true education. Teachers who possess scholarly proclivities, a sincere dedication to the task at hand and have some knowledge of the laws of learning and apply them to the teaching process can cause students to set high goals for themselves and dilligently work toward the achievement of these goals. These are the inspirational teachers. Coming from houses which have offered very little in the way of inspiration, the more perceptive student will readily discern inspiration in dedicated teachers.

Originality. This trait should be demanded in teachers of the talented and further, the expression of this trait should be encouraged in the talented students themselves. For the teacher, it is nothing more than creative teaching which is necessary to challenge the minds of the mentally superior. For the student, it revolves around a freedom of thought and expression. It should be remembered that talented young people have a strong inner urge to express themselves creatively and to be individuals; and that they perform better and are more highly motivated when in competition with others and their efforts rewarded with public recognition. With a teacher who stresses originality of approach rather than lock-step progression, each of his students is encouraged to grow according to his ability and achieve in relationship thereto. Thus, each student is challenged as an individual. Usually, morale rises with each accomplishment.

Personality. The personality of the teacher of the talented of the culturally deprived is of extreme importance. Whereas the teacher does not stand *in loco parenti* as is the case in early schooling, for college students in culturally deprived situations the teacher does become the one who is sought out for advice and one who is likely to give the student a sense of worth of himself. To this end, the teacher should present a personality which is at once compelling and approachable. Personal interaction between teacher and student should be capitalized upon fully, the teacher sharing with the student that part of his life which might prove inspirational, the teacher relating problems similar to those of the students which he has experienced and solved, the teacher always underscoring the fact that his background has been comparable to the background of those whom he teaches and the teacher finally emphasizing his refusal to let this background become a deterring factor to maximum achievement. For the teacher of this group cannot afford to assume the role of the ivory-towered professor whose interest in his students begins and ends with a normal class session, but rather one who sees in his students unlimited possibilities for success if their lives could but be touched and inspired.

An analysis of the problems faced by superior students from culturally deprived situations and a statement of some traits which should characterize the teachers of these students serve to clearly define the role of the teacher. The teacher should:

1. Exhibit to the students superiority in ability and excellence as a student.
2. Teach creatively, challenging to the maximum the minds of the students.
3. Attempt to awaken within every student that "vision of greatness."
4. Enter into a "relationship of encouragement" with the students.

All of the teacher's efforts, both in class and out, should be directed toward stimulating, encouraging and almost demanding that these superior students develop their capacities for growth and leadership and make maximum contributions to civilization. The teachers who possess the qualifications which have been outlined above are able to exert this kind of influence. The teachers who lack these qualifications are not. It simply becomes a task of assigning the most talented students if desired results are to accrue.

Above all, the teacher of the gifted must be one who sincerely believes that unless the talent in his keeping is developed to its maximum that he must assume some of the guilt for the waste. Further, he must feel that a teacher he does, in the words of Henry Adams, "affect eternity," and because of this consequential position he has made the decision to exert the best possible influence upon the minds with which he is entrusted. Finally, he should view this coveted privilege of working with the best minds that a university affords as an undertaking in the words of Milton "so sweet, so green, so fully of goodly prospects, and melodious sounds on every side, that the harp of Orpheus were not more charming."

THE ROLE OF READING IN IDENTIFYING AND DEVELOPING THE TALENTED

LYNETTE SAINE
Director, Reading Clinic, Atlanta University

At the college level the identification of talented or superior students may find obvious and subtle sources. The most obvious means is through general standardized tests such as those used for entrance and general placement. In the Atlanta University Center three types of tests have been used for more than fifteen years, with graduate and undergraduate students. They include the steeply timed Iowa Silent Reading Test; higher and lower levels of the Cooperative English Test, Reading Comprehension and the Survey Section of the Diagnostic Tests, by Triggs and others. The correlations of these tests with intelligence test results have been substantial. Over a period of five years—for the Iowa—the mean correlation with intelligence has been .63; for the Triggs .66 and for the Cooperative .81. When these distributions were studied further it appeared that the students falling above the 75th quartile enjoyed a even higher correlation in each of the instances. There was full recognition of the strong and weak points of the tests used. In reality we were getting fairly valid measures of the students' ability to find main ideas and details and to identify word meanings in general and specialized vocabularies. Yet, to us it seems significant that:

1. Superior students tended to rate higher on each type of reading test.
2. Their scores on the more difficult vocabulary sections of the tests were more accurate predictors than the total test scores. (Prediction of academic success)
3. Even if the over-all score tended to be low, a student who is superior tends to reflect advanced skills on some section of the tests. This has been par-

ticularly true in our use of the Van Wagenen Junior and Senior Levels of the tests.

For the first source of identification, therefore, we would say that test results give some insight into the possibility of superiority even with students who have been culturally deprived and have not had what might be called a balanced developmental program.

As a second source of identification—a study of certain types of responses to reading materials is less objective than test-identification, but highly indicative. This type of observation represents, furthermore, the recent trend toward supplementing test data with other findings of deeper significance than many of the short sections of the standardized measurement. In 1940, Gans did a study of the comprehension abilities involved in reading tests and reference materials. She found that reference reading required the reader to keep more elements in mind while reading, to perceive the significance of the various elements in relation to the total problem situation and to reformulate the problem continuously. In graduate and undergraduate reading classes I have checked the levels of responses to reading materials. Whether the superior students were top-flight readers or not it was observed that the more academically talented student:

1. Operated on a level of inductive thinking and concept formation which was often much more accurate than the average student who might have made a higher score on the reading test.
2. Seemed to reenforce his or her interest in reading if the approach permitted the use of more problem-solving techniques. Often, this meant that the more gifted student raised the reading level significantly without the need for systematic reading instruction. Certainly, this does not refer to the gifted student who is seriously disabled in reading.
3. Engaged quite vigorously in critical reading, but was frequently deterred by limitations in the conditions of critical thinking.

4. Had a longer span of attention in and accurate interpretation of the more expository type of writing.

A third area of identification is in a creative approach to reading materials. Frequently, in areas of the social sciences and the humanities, the superior student may be identified through his ability to respond creatively to material read by him or even read to him. If given the opportunity the superior student will usually see relationships and images and gain perspective much greater than those of less intellectual potential achieve. Cronback, one of Terman's gifted children of more than thirty years ago, has written a classic volume, *The Esentials of Psychological Testing*. In that book he gives illustrations of how the more highly gifted pilots would gain quick perception of certain problems and begin to contrive and design far beyond the given pattern presented. Similarly, superior students usually grasp quickly the structure of main ideas and implications and welcome an opportunity to apply their insights to predicting, imagining and generalizing.

Before I leave the point of identification I should like to mention a promising trend which may yield even greater possibilities for identification of students. We have realized that there is a greater need for sharper definitions of reading skills and abilities needed in achieving various reading tasks. For years now investigators in the field have been making factor analyses of skills in relationship to the specific tasks faced by the reader. At last year's International Reading Conference Donald Smith predicted that as we learn more about what skills are required for reading expository, narrative, or lyric materials of different types we shall be able to draw a truer profile of the reader. It would be my prediction that the superior reader may present a different type of configuration from the less capable and thereby send us more quickly to the type of teaching needed by different types of students.

Time will not permit my going to the equally thrilling possibilities in the more personality-centered approach to the teaching of reading; hence, I shall move now to the *second* responsibility of this discussion. Reading can aid in the development of the superior student through a balanced program which will give opportunity for:

1. The continued development of basic reading abilities
2. Vigorous development of vocabulary
3. Appropriate instruction in reading in subject areas
4. Development and refinement of general reading interests and tastes
5. Well-timed emphasis on appropriate use of reading skills for different purposes and types of content

Let us consider each area of reading instruction, first, in terms of students need of it and secondly, within areas wherein students may be particularly challenged. First of all, you will recognize this emphasis on the development of reading skills as a part of a philosophy which insists that just as all students need training in English composition, so they need the benefits of being taught how to make the fullest use of skills of communicating with the written symbol. Most of the studies made in this area emphasize the fact that most of the abilities may be established at elementary and high school levels, but those more closely related to higher levels of thought cannot be rendered powerful until they have been exercised upon percepts, images, memories and concepts which only the business of living can afford. Think of such skills as:

1. Surveying a controversial article for objective assessment of ideas presented
2. Sketching an outline or pattern of ideas in order to check adequacy of treatment
3. Noting instances wherein the writer is particularly strong in his treatment of ideas and is able to appreciate reasons for the fact.
4. Noting instances of bias, "straw man techniques" and other propangandistic devices.

The superior student usually has the ability and the desire to engage in this kind of thoughtful reading if he has the needed background, and often if he has not he will make use of ideas and come forward with explanations beyond the teacher's wildest dreams!

Closely related to background skills is the area of vocabulary development. For the superior student who is culturally deprived there is usually a tremendous need. This is an area that seems so very easy to develop. Word lists and programs run the gamut from *30 Days to a More Powerful Vocabulary* to *The Tyranny of Words*. Yet, Guy Buswell in a study of adult reading and more recent investigators demonstrate the fact that isolated word study is often superficial and temporary in its benefits. The reports stress the importance of gradual and meaningful vocabulary growth.

We might note that most of the investigators have done their work in North, Eastern and Western sections, with very few minority group representatives in the populations. It may be then, that culturally deprived groups need the concentrated study which would provide a sound base of word and a corrected vocabulary and then they would be more ready for the gradual and penetrating guidance which substantial vocabulary development requires.

It may be concluded, finally, that since present intelligence test findings reveal a substantial correlation between vocabulary development and mental ability, we would do well to expose the talented to the dual approach. This means that teachers of all areas do a very real service when they encourage ideas that are well expressed, call attention to good writing in text or references and encourage students to incorporate more acceptable phrases into their vocabularies.

At this point I shall omit a longer discussion of reading in the subject areas and state that much which I shall say regarding the latter sections of the reading task will emphasize the fact that the more continuous and flexible the teaching of reading the more opportunities all students have to grow and the greater the possibilities of unlocking potentialities within the more gifted.

The area of reading interests and tastes is a "crucially limited one." In the country as a whole the reading diet is fuller of pictures and digested articles than of substantial content; and among culturally deprived groups the picture is even darker. The talented pupil or student is often an avid reader, but all too often he is a consumer of trash.

Here recently Stuart Chase has written a book called, *Some Things Worth Knowing*. The theme of his book calls for persons who are willing to be "Generalists" and, as John Stuart Mill would say, shop intelligently at the knowledgeable counters of the world. As I read through the general sections of this book I thought of the kind of readers I found in my study leading toward the doctorate: reading interests and preferences catering to the spectacular, the gossip-centered sheets and almost illiterate in the areas of literature and fine arts. The job of creating a desire for reading becomes a first real task and perhaps the real hope for bridging the gaps left by the cultural lag. This year in the Atlanta University Center each college spent the major portion of a $750.00 budget in purchasing personal books. Indeed it is a rare spectacle to find a student who gets excited about ideas, titles or personalities found in these collections. The easy elementary school diet of the basic readers, the prostration of literature in many of our high school classrooms and the limited reading backgrounds of many of us in the teaching profession is taking its toll of superior potentialities.

Without leaving this on a totally defeatist note, I would say that many student groups are doing something about the lag; many honors classes are motivating avidity on a more substantial basis, and many teachers and adults are taking Great Books courses on their own.

A final possibility is through helping the student to make reading his flexible tool, a means of power. Perhaps, one of the most promising areas is in recent research-discussions given by several reports. It is the current emphasis on being certain that teachers and students understand the reading process; therein it becomes a more flexible tool for use in many situations. This is important to all students, but perhaps most helpful to the gifted student:

1. The student who has some talent in the scientific area appreciates an approach to reading that lifts the dull veil of varied exercises and explains how we read and what factors tend to facilitate or retard progress. This kind of insight keeps the alert mind continuously growing in the process.
2. The student who has thrills and fascination as he learns theories within a psychology class has greater faith in the process when he learns that it can be explained in terms of the associative, purposive and field theories, not in long involved explanations, but in giving the thinking mind reasons for suggestions and directions:
    - Survey your reading—to gain insights and perspective at a high level which would be a credit to the Gestaltists or a Levin
    - Raise questions—or how can you be assured of accuracies in stimuli and responses needed in associations and later re-inforcement
    - Read purposefully—or how can the process be considered goal-centered at its heart
    - Recite—or how can you be certain that your cognitive map is in agreement with the chart of the author
    - Read again in order to bring about the dynamic integration which the processes of learning should achieve

If the reading program would develop the superior student beyond the mediocre and the average it must be mindful of the surging and penetrating idea that maturity in reading is a function of what we do toward helping in the development of a mature individual.

THE ROLE OF REMEDIAL PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPING THE TALENTED OF THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED

WILLIE C. DAVIS
Department of English, Clark College

In addressing a group of New England parents concerned with how they could prepare their children for college, Miss Mary Ellen Chase, Vice-President and Director of Admissions at Wellesley College, made this provocative statement:

> A sense of language is the key which opens our very rich storehouse of culture. Without that key culture is a prison and study is a form of forced labor without any reward.

Here Miss Chase points directly to the heart of the problem with which we are concerned today—the problem of the culturally deprived, for one learns culture as one learns language. It is the fortunate student whose home, school and community have awakened in him a sense of language, for through experiences involving language he develops his attitudes toward self, toward others, toward life on earth, and toward man's relationship with man.

Having looked, during this Conference, at other means of developing the talented of the culturally deprived, we now focus directly upon the school and one kind of program designed especially to compensate for the deterring effects upon the gifted. We look at the role of remedial programs. In professional literature this kind of program is being described as remedial, corrective, or developmental.

It is only in recent years that the need for such programs has been realized, for it has been thought that the superior student will rise in spite of his difficulties. However, as the President of Bowdoin College said recently:

> In unsuccessfully trying to raise the slow learner to

the level of the average, the gifted have been retarded and the average depressed.

Today the picture is changing. Conferences such as this, projects, studies, research—all point toward closing the gaps in the continuum of educational challenge and opportunity. Attempts are now being made to provide specially designed programs to enable the academically talented to reach their maximum.

The role of the remedial program for the talented student may be broadly conceived as that of all good teaching —to take the student at his own level and to lead him to increased standards of competence; for the gifted, we might emphasize, to bring to fruition the rich promise of his youth by stimulating him to make the most of his potentialities. This means then that the remedial program must be so designed as to discover and remove interfering factors. To consider the role of the remedial program in realizing this aim, we must answer three questions:

What are the types of problems characteristic of the gifted student in need of remedial help?

What remediation is indicated? In other words, how can the remedial program solve these problems?

What is the role of the remedial teacher in the successful remedial program?

I shall suggest some answers to these three questions first by taking a look at three characteristics which handicap the gifted student and recommending remediation for each and, secondly, by pointing out the crucial role played by the teacher in the remedial program.

Where the superior students have been culturally deprived, we are dealing with a unique group—unique in the sense that factors which have been causative in failure to develop their potentialities are indicative of the whole group affect each student as an individual. Since each student in his own stage of development progresses at a given moment from the point which he has actually reached, discovering where the student is new is the first concern of the remedial program. Though we may anticipate certain general weaknesses, there are three particular weaknesses which we may call handicapping factors. They are *attitude*, *content*, and *thought* process. These three may not have been catalogued in professional literature, as such, but they are some of the actual characteristics that many of us college teachers know.

Let us look at attitude. Every student's attitude problem is different, but *one* is usually characteristic. That is the problem of boredom, which manifests itself in different ways. Some students are bored in a defiant way. They walk into class with the attitude of "abiding" the hour. Others express their boredom in daydreaming. They have developed a mechanism for escaping the unchallenging class by rapid departure into imaginary interests. By the time we get these students, this has become so deeply rooted that even when we offer them challenge, the habit of daydreaming persists. There are, of course, many other types of attitude problems which all of us can cite from our own experiences. The important thing to realize is that the problem of attitude which characterizes this gifted type is personal. The remedial approach to the problem of attitude must be that which stems from and is related to the attitude problem, yet, for example, to that of sheer background. If remediation is not imbedded in attitude, it leaves the potentiality unchallenged.

In the same way the gifted student is often suffering from the second handicap—that of content. Although it is a separate factor, it has already made its contribution to the student's attitude. Because of his superior mind, he has been able to advance his own knowledge by picking up information through the mere business of living. Therefore, he finds school colorless and often the content superficial against his own experiential knowledge. Soon he ceases to expect meaning from courses he is required to take. At this point he develops the type of mental response that keeps school or class content from being associated with the meaningful context of his private thought—life. He therefore applies to this surface context the lowest level of thought that he finds necessary. Having a good mind, he often finds that he can sponge in school information without effort and soon gets his only delight from school in the readiness with which he can amass content without discipline. The result is that this type of student brings to college enough fragments of content to meet standards of achievement required for entrance, but the organization of such content is inadequate to serve as a background for various courses which he will pursue. In many cases, this student needs a pause from acquiring more content in order that the teacher may put him into possession of information he has already acquired.

Remediation for this problem, then, requires that a teacher not only assess these bits of unrelated fragments, but that she bring these facts into meaningful relationship and help him acquire the type of fluency and mobility of ideas so necessary for originality, creativity, and versatility—qualities within the potential power of every superior student.

Related to the problems of attitude and content is the third factor—that of thought process. The truly retarded student—the student of low potentialities—has over the years learned the lesson of discipline, application, and perseverance. These he has found necessary to his survival. Because the potentially gifted student, though unchallenged, has been able to meet the required standards, he has not cultivated sustained effort or deep thought. He has completely lost the significance of the intrinsic worth of rigorous study. This must be restored.

More and more we are discovering that real learning is pursuit. Too often the superior student has had nothing to pursue. This indicates that even the content must be something that extends him to the point that real mental effort is a requirement.

Another type of deterring factor in the thought process is the absence of guidance toward the mature levels of thinking of which the superior student is capable. It is at this point that educational literature often emphasizes the need for gifted teachers of gifted students. Although this is not necessarily true, it does emphasize the fact that those of us who guide the gifted toward mature levels must have definite knowledge relative to what these levels are, the process of thought which they involve, as well as their content for the student. This brings us to the crucial role of the remedial teacher in the remedial program.

In the February issue of *The Reading Teacher*, published by the International Reading Association, there are several articles which indicate the many different levels at which thought process may operate. A teacher, unaware of these levels, may, year in and year out, utilize a very low level of thought, even as she varies her content. The superior student is seen bored by this experience and not only is arrested in his development, but loses interest that soon involves attitude and undermines effort.

Perhaps Overstreet in *The Mature Mind* expresses the ultimate aim of all teachers in relation to development of the thought process as he says of the mature mind.

> [It is] not one who has come to a certain level of achievement and stopped there. It is rather a person whose linkages with life are becoming stronger and richer because his attitudes are such to encourage their growth rather than their stoppage.

The remedial teacher must know and be able to use short-cut methods and materials. The very existence of superior ability gives the teacher the advantage of rapidly bridging the gaps through developmental experience that eliminate steps that are unnecessary in the progression of students to higher and higher levels of understanding.

Using data from tests, observation, and insight, the remedial teacher must both be able to interpret the lethargy that characterizes so many superior students who have known no challenge for years, and, at the same time, recognize and immediately utilize the spark of enthusiasm resulting from challenging tasks which she provides. Here she must be patient, realizing that attitudes and habits that a student has for years been building cannot be overcome suddenly. Even when a teacher thinks she has sparked a student, there will be days when the spark goes out and the student must be restimulated.

Any program *is* the teacher. And because the core of the remedial program is diagnosing and treating problems peculiar to each individual student, the success of the remedial program depends upon the teacher.

Thus, it would seem that the role of the remedial program is clearly defined. Barriers which are active in each potentially gifted student must be identified. There must be enough versatility to provide materials or guidelines that this particular barrier requires. The student himself must be challenged to utilize what is there in his own remedial program. This is a unique job—unique because the problem is personal and remediation must be personal. What may be appropriate for one with low potentials may be very inappropriate for one with high potentials. This means that the teacher must be sensitive to developing information given by the student in his daily activities. This is a role that a teacher can perform through a preparation that comes with constant interpretation of her own experiences with students. This role, though not apparent to the student, must be quite clear to the teacher. As the student moves with what he considers freedom, the teacher makes sure that he moves developmentally; that his choices are not random; that the framework of all of his mental efforts has been so designed that every activity is geared to involve higher and higher thought levels with richer and richer content. This gives him the sense of language which, as Miss Chase points out, is the key to the storehouse of culture from which he has been barred. With this key, he becomes liberated from factors which once impeded him—yes, even from his teacher.

The hope of every remedial program is justified in the fact that the intelligence spark, though deactivated, never dies. This is the challenge.

AN ACADEMIC TALENT SEARCH AMONG THE LESS PRIVILEGED GROUPS

DANIEL SCHREIBER
Coordinator, Higher Horizon Program

A talent search to discover, identify and stimulate academically able students from less privileged groups has been in progress in New York City's Manhattanville Junior High School and George Washington High School since September, 1956. The program was initiated by the Board of Education because it firmly believed that unless a program was developed to overcome the stifling of educational motivation in children from families, struggling economically and without an educational tradition, the ratio of children from such homes attending college in proportion to their school enrollment would remain appallingly low. Many of these children tend to leave school at the earliest possible moment in order to earn money to contribute to their families. In failing to achieve at their educational potential, they are not only depressed vocationally and academically for the rest of their lives, but are lost to the skilled technical and professional manpower pools that our nation needs so urgently in this technological age.

The project was planned for a six year period so that all the students who were in the junior high school in September, 1956, could be followed through graduation from senior high school. It is now half-over and most of the identified students are in senior high school, the majority at George Washington.

This report will deal with our successes and failures during this three year period.

It is most appropriate at this time to express my gratitude to two organizations that made this project possible, the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students and the College Entrance Examination Board. Although the Board of Education had approved the project, it was too late in the budget year to appropriate additional funds. These funds were supplied by these two outstanding organizations. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation for the advice and help given me by Mr. Richard L. Plaut of N.S.S.F.N.S. and Dr. Sheldrick Kendrick, Vice President of C.E.E.B.

Background of the School and Community

Manhattanville Junior High School, which has a student population of approximately 1500, is located at 129th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, down the hill from two great institutions of higher learning, Columbia University and the College of the City of New York, so that from Manhattanville, one must go up.

The ethnic ratios in the junior high school are approximately 40% Puerto Rican, 45% Negro and 15% white and others.

In addition to their other deprivations many children came from broken homes, no father, working mothers, where the teacher becomes the parent substitute. Others come from motherless homes with children living with father, grandmother or aunts. The impact on these children is much greater than on the child in the fatherless home mainly because of the role given to mothers in relation to child rearing in our culture.

Special problems arise in the cases of those newly arrived from Puerto Rico and the South. All of them must orient themselves to a new high pressure urban society with different cultural values, and, in addition, the Spanish-speaking students must learn English. In most cases their educational background is inadequate. It becomes necessary, therefore, to provide remedial services and a culture set-up which they can adopt and which will raise their cultural sights so that they can take their rightful places in our present technological age.

The Over-All Plan

Since a study of the junior high school graduating class of 1953 indicated that approximately 8% of this group applied for admission to post-high school institutions in 1956 and less than 4% to full time liberal arts colleges, the school felt that certain problems would have to be overcome if the goals of the Guidance Project were to be attained. Some of these problems were:

1. identifying the college able students who heretofore were not identified
2. stimulating the college able students who were *not* thinking of college
3. creating the aspiration of a college education in the minds of the students
4. educating the community and the parents to accept the worthwhileness of a college education
5. planning a teacher training program and getting the wholehearted cooperation of the faculty
6. guiding the pupils and their parents through an extensive and intensive group and individual guidance program
7. providing remedial work in order to bring the pupils up to and beyond grade level, and
8. raising the cultural level of the pupils and the community

Identification and Selection

In order to identify the able pupils, the cumulative record card of every child was studied. In addition, the entire school body of 1500 students was given the SRA Non-Verbal Intelligence Test, the Stanford Reading Test, the Stanford Arithmetic Test, and the "Draw a Person" Test, a projective test.

These results, together with their sixth and eighth year scores on standardized tests of intelligence, reading and arithmetic, plus their major subject teachers' evaluations—a matter of ten criteria in all—were used to identify the children. Each teacher rated his students on a 1 to 4 scale; 1 indicated "very good college potential" while 4 indicated "very poor college potential". In order to make certain that no one teacher influenced his colleagues, separate class lists were given to each teacher.

In general, those students who scored four or more in the criteria were selected for the experimental group. The reason for using a score of 4 was that it permitted us to include approximately 50% of the student body, the upper half of the school. In keeping with the aim of the project, a basic principle of selection was to include any student who might possibly have academic potential.

Guidance Program in the Junior High School

The guidance activities for the experimental group were carried out by three special counselors assigned to the project with some assistance from the coordinator. Each counselor was assigned to one grade to conduct group guidance and individual counseling for the experimental students in that grade. It was our hope that the students would remain with the same counselor during the student's secondary career. Except for the counselor of the 9th grade, this did not materialize because the senior high school thought it best to use its own personnel rather than take junior high school personnel.

In order to gain information about each student's goals, his impression of his parent's goals for him, the educational and vocational background of the family and the family's economic status, all students answered a series of questionnaires.

Although the regular course of study was followed, greater stress was placed on careers and career planning. In order to show our students that all avenues were open to them, counselors and students prepared an achievement chart with photographs of successful individuals of various ethnic background whose abilities had enabled them to gain recognition in their chosen field. The captioned photographs of these new heroes and heroines were a potent stimulant to our students.

As part of the study on careers, students visited research centers, professional schools and hospitals. Among the places visited were the Brookhaven Atomic Energy Laboratories, Sloan Kettering Cancer Research Center and N.Y.U.—Bellevue Research Center. Our students learned at first hand the educational requirements for the different professions; many of them became aware, for the first time, that college graduates, not necessarily licensed doctors or dentists, were research workers.

Remedial Services—Reading and Arithmetic

Four teachers, two to each subject, were assigned to cope with this problem. In general, 100 students received individual help in each subject each year. In addition to working with small groups of students, these remedial teachers gave demonstration lessons and trained other teachers in the use of improved techniques of teaching.

Educational and Cultural Enrichment

It was our hope that the cultural level of our children could be raised by following a program that would enable them to enjoy good music, stimulate wide reading, love good theater and recognize and know fine art. A three-fold learning attack was made in each activity. For example, if a group were going to the Metropolitan Opera House, first, they would view a strip-film about the opera and listen to an operagraph recording; secondly, they would hear and see the opera, and finally they would come back to school to hear it again and discuss it. It is hard to resist or forget an experience after this.

In preparation for the first concert, or first opera, or first Broadway show, much spade work had to be done. Some students were reluctant to attend, and a real coaxing job had to be done on these students who felt that the recordings had served them with as much music as they felt they wanted. Parents were reluctant to permit children to travel out of the community. They objected to their losing gainful employment or at the very least of losing their assistance at home. Personal interviews, as well as, telephone conferences with parents and employers, were held, in order to gain their approval and consent. Some of the places visited were Carnegie Hall to hear the New York Philharmonic; Metropolitan Opera House, where they heard *Don Carlo, Tosca,* and other operas; Broadway theaters where they saw such shows as *Sunrise at Campobello, Time*

Remembered and *Ages of Man*. Whenever possible arrangements were made for the students to go back stage to meet the principal actors. They were especially fortunate to meet with Sir John Gielgud and Helen Hayes.

Visits to Colleges

Since our goal was admission to college, we thought it wise to acquaint our students with college life. In some instances we visited actual classrooms and laboratories and met with students and instructors, while in others, we toured the campuses, had lunch and saw a college football game. Our students have been to C.C.N.Y., Columbia, New York University, Manhattan, Pace, Wagner, Hofstra, Rutgers, Princeton and Yale Universities. As I wrote this I was going to put Princeton first because this was the first college we visited, and our experience there was so pleasant, but rather than be accused of being "ivy-league conscious", —my son is only 11 years old—I arranged the colleges in order of their distance from our school. I hope I am forgiven.

Scholarship Fund

Earlier in my talk I mentioned my gratitude to N.S.S. F.N.S. and to C.E.E.B. Although New York City spends hundreds of millions of dollars on education annually, no school is given any cash. N.S.S.F.N.S. and C.E.E.B. came to our rescue. The school was allotted $2000 a year in cash for its scholarship fund, and because of this no pupil was deprived of participating in any activity due to his inability to pay for the activity. This made it easier for us to have all students participate fully in the enriched program. For example, the trip to Yale University including bus transportation and admission to the football game cost those students who could pay $1. Those who could not afford to pay this amount paid less, or, in case of dire need, paid nothing. Originally, the money was to be used to help able students who had to seek after-school employment and whose academic work suffered thereby. At the junior high school level, we did not find too many students who needed this kind of help, so instead we used the money to enrich the lives of our students. On behalf of the 1500 students in our school, I, again, would like to thank you for making this possible.

Speech

Since admission to college is one of our goals and since the speech pattern of many of our students is poor, and since they will have to appear before college admission officers for interviews, a program to raise and improve their speech pattern was initiated. An inservice teacher training course, carrying salary increment credit was given at the school by a speech expert, and twenty-eight teachers took the course.

Parent Education

Special day-time meetings were held in order to acquaint the parents with the over-all goals of the project. They were told of our hopes and our desires and their co-operation, understanding and help was invited. Evening meetings were held for those parents who could not attend day meetings, and in those cases where a parent could not attend either meeting, the social case worker or guidance counselor visited the home in order to acquaint the parent with the goals of the project.

The response from the parents was most encouraging.

Successes, Failures and Unsolved Problems

I put successes first because they so far outweigh our failures, and because I take pride in the accomplishments of our students and their parents in raising their educational and vocational sights. Before I tell you of our successes and failures, let me read to you from a letter that I received on September 14th from a girl who graduated from our school this past June.

> "Dear Mr. Schreiber:
>
> Last month I won a four-year college scholarship to any college I wish to go to. I won it by making a speech, *Freedom Moves Forward Through Education.* I represented New York and competed against girls from other states. Wish you were there."

I, too, wish I were there. Colleagues, I offer this in due modesty. I doubt very much that this could have happened in our school community four years ago.

Reading

A study of the growth in reading made by the students in the different grades showed a rate of growth of 1.5 years per year. This compares most favorably with their previous growth of 0.8 year per year. In previous years, students who entered our school 1.5 retarded left us on graduation 2.0 years retarded. The experimental group that graduated this past June had the following record in reading (based on 147 students who were present for all three tests): from 1.4 years retarded in the 7th grade to 0.3 years *above* grade in the 9th grade. In the 7th grade, only 1 student out of 5 was on or above grade level. In the 9th grade, it was better than 1 student out of 2, which is better than a normal distribution. The median student has a growth of 4.3 years in 2.6 years.

It is interesting to note that although the median boy was further retarded than the median girl, his grades were greater and his final score was higher.

Although the median growth was great, not all students achieved this growth. In fact 13 students, 3 boys and 10 girls, did not make gains of year per year. Also approximately 20 percent of the group were 1.5 years or more retarded at graduation time.

Our study showed that once a student is taught how to read, is encouraged to read, learns to enjoy reading and is motivated by a desire to better himself, he will do supplementary reading on his own. This additional reading increases his understanding and improves his scholastic work.

Arithmetic

Although the gains were better than gains made in previous years, the median gain was less than year for year. The median student who was assigned to remedial arithmetic exceeded this gain but the total group did not. One reason given for this is that arithmetic is a school subject. Unlike reading, arithmetic is seldom undertaken by students at home on their own.

Last year, we tried an experiment of having half-classes in mathematics. The results were varied. In some cases, able students made greater gains, while in other cases, they made the expected gain. Whether this was due to the teacher, the method of presentation, or the motivation, it is difficult to say. Both teachers are classified as good teachers.

We continued this experiment and there was an improvement as measured by the Seattle Half Year Algebra Test. In 1958, the median student had a score in the 25 percentile below normal, while in 1959, the score was in the 35th percentile, which is classified as normal, although in the low range.

Speech

There has been a slight improvement in the speech patterns of our students. However many still employ the vulgarisms common to the community. It is our belief that speech work should begin at an earlier level and continue throughout the student's school career if he is to speak with an acceptable and approved speech pattern.

Guidance

Careers and career planning should start in the 7th year. The trips to colleges whetted the appetites of our children for more of this. Their questions showed their interest in learning about careers.

The parents cooperated with the guidance counselors. Each year approximately 600 interviews were held with parents. Many were multiple interviews. Our study of the *Hard To Reach Parent* showed that they really weren't hard to reach. Either they had to work or had to take care of their home and thus could not come to school. Most of them were cooperative when visited at home by the social worker or guidance counselor.

In general, it was not difficult for the counselor to raise the educational and vocational sights of parents where their sights were lower than their children's. However, in one broad area, this was almost impossible. This concerned parents of able girls from Puerto Rican background who felt that a secretarial course was good enough. "If it were my son, I would be glad to have him think of college, but not my daughter."

The psychologist and social worker who were assigned to the school one and one-half days a week, respectively, found that this was inadequate to service all the students who needed help. For example, during the year 1957-58, the psychologist handled only 21 cases. The problems ranged from deep-seated personality disturbances to major or minor environmental factors causing conflict and tensions for the student.

After School Study Room

In an attempt to extend remedial services and also to provide facilities for doing homework for those without adequate accommodations at home, after school classes on a voluntary basis were set up and were staffed by regular teachers. The number of students who took advantage of this was small in comparison to the total group. However, the attendance always went up before specific tests.

Parent Education

Attendance at day time parents' meetings increased steadily throughout the three years. In the last year it averaged 34% which compares most favorably with a city wide average of 10%. It is noteworthy that the majority of parents will take time off from work to come for an interview concerning their own child even when they do not come to meetings.

In response to a questionnaire sent to parents in 1957, 38% of those who replied stated that they would like to see the counselor. In May, 1958, one year later, the percentage was 84%. Parents came to recognize the value of the counseling interview.

In terms of educational aspirations, the parents responding both years were overwhelmingly interested in higher education for their children. Nearly 100% of those responding said they would like their children to graduate from high school and more than 80% stated they would like their children to go to college. In answer to questions on financial need, 50% stated that they would definitely need financial help for college and another 30% said, "maybe". In other words, nearly four-fifths of our group may need financial aid for college.

Educational and Cultural Enrichment

If we were to interest our students, we had to offer them activities that were completely new. While lessons to prepare for activities heightened interest and slanted attention toward things to look for and discuss later, lectures *per se* either at the place visited or at the school by invited guests were less successful than we had hoped.

During our first year, we introduced one dance concert to which we invited only girls. The second year both boys and girls were invited. Last year, this activity became one of the most sought-after activities.

Attendance at the Philharmonic concerts increased. Not only were the students interested in the music but they enjoyed going to a local cafeteria for refreshments after the concerts. They looked forward to this because they saw other parents and their children doing the same thing.

After the first year, opera performances achieved more status when the opera conventions were no longer startling, new or peculiar. The Gilbert and Sullivan operettas met with less favor than one would suppose. In a way, before one can laugh at something, one must know what that something is, and although the presentation lessons made that attempt, these lessons were less successful. This could not be said for Shakespeare, which shows how much Shakespeare always can appeal to all ages and all times.

The football games to out of town colleges were wonderful dreams come true but it was the visits to the local colleges which created the greatest interest since these were more likely of attainment.

Each year more books were bought at the Book Fair than the year before, and the books bought were of better quality—more classic than ever. Teachers reported that more good books were read for book reports.

Our biggest job seemed to be to make them "want" to do things since we found that when they did they sought for further experience.

J. H. S. Student Reaction to the Project

Student responses to a questionnaire and student compositions were studied for their reaction to the project. The basic questions were: (1) How has the project helped you this year? and (2) What would you like the project to do for you next year? The vast majority of students felt that the project had helped them and mentioned many ways in which it had done so. Their suggestions were mainly in terms of expansion of current services and the introduction of some new features.

More than 80% of the group checked that the project had encouraged them in plans to graduate from high school, had helped them in learning about careers and in thinking about choice of career and had helped them on how to get along with people. Approximately three-fourths of the group felt that the project had raised their ambitions, encouraged them to think about going to college, and took them to places that they had never been to before.

Student Progress Through the Grades

You may recall that I had stated earlier that approximately 250 students, or 50%, on each grade was identified as having college potential. Of the 250 - 9th grade students, the 1957 graduates, approximately 150 continued on at George Washington High School as part of the project. In March, 1959, a year and a half later, only 102 were still in the academic course. There had been a number of shifts in courses, particularly from the academic to the general course because of demonstrated inability to do college preparatory work. Present indications are that about one-half of the remaining group will be able to maintain themselves. Two of the students in this group are now the number 1 and 3 man scholastically in the school. This honor had never been achieved by a "43" graduate.

On the basis of our experience with the first group, our criteria for selection for continuation in the senior high school project were refined. In June, 1958, 132 students were so identified but only 111 wanted to continue academic work. In April, 1959, 85 of these students still remained in the project, the others were transferred to commercial or general courses. For both years the number remaining is a minimum number. This number does not represent those project students who were admitted to special academic high schools.

In order to get a better frame of reference, I would like to bring to your attention the results of our 1954 graduates—a non-project group. Of this group of 470 students, only 42% graduated from senior high school, and only 4%, 18 students, are in full-time attendance at a liberal arts college.

A comparison study made between the work of the 148 - 1957 graduates and the 105 - 1953 graduates after one year of study at George Washington showed the following: Only 5 pupils in the 1953 group passed all their subjects and only 2 had an average of at least 80%. For the project group, 38 passed all their subjects and 18 had an average of at least 80%. If one equates both groups to the same base, five times as many 1957 students passed as did their older brothers and sisters.

Changes In I. Q. Scores

A comparison of scores achieved by 148 students on the Otis Beta taken in 1955 and in 1959 showed a positive increase from 94 to 98. This gain is good because for groups such as the "43" group, a school I. Q. score, not intelligence, tends to become lower the longer cultural deprivation continues. Approximately 30 students or one-fifth of the group showed gains of 11 points or more while 14 students showed losses of 11 points or more. This is better than one-third of the group. Boys, in general, showed better gains than girls.

Delinquency, Misbehavior and the Project

A studied and determined attempt, and I may say, a very successful one, was made to dissociate the project from any anti-delinquency program. It was felt that this was a program to raise educational sights and that if any improvement in behavior resulted, it would be a concomitant one and not the primary goal. However, in the light of all the publicity that juvenile delinquents in New York City have been receiving, I decided to do some comparison studies in this field. First, let me say that just as we have our outstanding good students at "43", so, too, do we have our delinquents. In fact, several of the teen-agers who were involved in the infamous Michael Farmer murder of two years ago came from "43", and the "umbrella man" of the horrible murders that took place this summer is one of our former students.

Let me give you the reaction of the principal of George Washington High School:

> "In the past, the students from "43" were our worst behaved. More teacher and administrative time was spent on them than on any other group. Since we had the project group this has changed. Not a single student in the project group has been reported to the Dean's office for discipline. All are attentive in class, even in those cases where the subject matter seems to be too difficult for them. Today, they are our best behaved."

Now, for some objective and statistical comparisons. I thought it best to compare the 5 year record of Children's Court appearances of the students from J. H. S. 43 with the record made by the students from six comparable junior high schools. The age of the group is roughly 12 to 16 years of age. The percentage increase for court appearances per 1000 population for the years 1954 to 1959 for J. H. S. 43 students was one-third that of the six comparable junior high schools, and one-half of the entire city.

Although there has been a slight increase of incidence of court appearance by the students from "43", it is much less than experienced by the six comparable junior high schools and the City of New York.

I would like to conclude now and answer some of your questions, but rather than tell you how much one is impressed by the students' and parents' recognition of the school's efforts and of their desire to improve, I'll read you a statement made by one of our students to a group of visitors after she had been asked how the project helped her. In the 7th grade, she was one and one-half below grade level in reading and one year below grade level in arithmetic. Today, she is above grade level in reading and up to grade level in arithmetic.

I believe she expresses the feelings of her fellow classmates.

> "I think the greatest thing in this project has been the part which urged us so deeply to go to college. When I first got to "43", I thought that college was only for the rich families and people of high class, and I, myself, live in a very poor neighborhood. I felt I was not for college, but in "43", the urge and inspiration and everything that we received from the people in the project, proved to me that I was just as capable of going to college as the son of a movie star. So long as you have good marks and you want to go to college, there is nothing that could stop me."

Colleagues, especially you who are admission officers, please don't stop our children.

NEXT STEPS IN IDENTIFYING AND ENCOURAGING TALENTED NEGRO YOUTH

ALBERT N. WHITING
Dean, Morgan State College

Since the time is short I am not going to make any effort to present what I have to say in any particularly erudite and structured fashion. I am concerned here first with the term "talent." As one reads the literature it is clear that the concept is not used with precision. In some instances it refers to ability or aptitude, in others it is used to describe talented performance or behavior beyond the ordinary in meeting some criterion of desirability.

This ambiguity to which I am pointing has, as is often the case, some theoretical significance which relates to a problem in the process of the identification of superior students, the solution of which is one of the "next steps" which I feel must be isolated. When we say that we want to identify talent we mean simultaneously that we want to find people who have potential talent now and who in addition will, on a subsequent occasion, turn in a talented performance. To pursue the distinction one step further, we usually measure potential talent by sampling behavior in one situation and actual talent by sampling what may be a different kind of behavior in a different situation. At times the difference between test behavior and criterion behavior, as it is called, may be very considerable. (It is very difficult, for example, to tell from test scores made in school whether a boy is likely to be a "success" in life in a certain profession or in business and it is at this point that we head for trouble.) Granting that traits and situations do not remain the same over time, what can we do?

1. We need studies of the constancy of various traits over time and in particular the way in which they develop throughout childhood.

2. We need to analyze the functional characteristics of various performance situations (i.e. school, professions, occupations) so that by uncovering functional identities across situations we can better make our predictions. Medicine, as Parsons has argued, is a profession which requires for various societal reasons a considerable degree of "affective neutrality" or impulse control. It looks as if the prolonged period of training for medicine may require the same characteristic—and require it to such an extent that people who do not have it drop out. Thus one might be able to argue, on the basis of the identity of functional requirements of a long medical training and of the medical profession, that medical training provides a good, if unintentional, means of selecting individuals fit for the profession. So then performance in medical school, in short, is a good predictor of performance as a doctor. The two are functionally similar.
3. We need studies which will shed some light on relationships over time by testing different individuals at different stages of development. For example, will what appears to be high mathematical ability at age 10, in a private school situation, persist through adulthood and be exhibited in professional life without the constant stimulus and personal interest and individualized attention of a dedicated private school teacher?

This overall problem to which I have referred leads rather dramatically to the frustrations which so many educators and/or talent scouts have experienced in the "late bloomer" and the "morning glory." This points up, I reiterate, the fact that talent selection purely on the basis of school performance is only a fairly effective means of identification and other devices must be developed because it is imperative that we do not miss out on even a few, present demands being what they are. The basic error here lies in the assumption that school and life require identical abilities. What the "late bloomer" and the "morning glory" show is not so much that individual characteristics wax and wane, but that different situations call for different types of talented performance (e.g. nothing at Harvard to bring out in Roosevelt the characteristics of leadership he displayed later, though he may have had them even then.)

Another problem of equal importance which constitutes a next step to be cleared revolves around the question: What evidence is there that intelligence is not a threshold type of variable—that once a person has a certain minimal level of intelligence, his performance beyond that level is not uncorrelated with his ability? A number of studies have shown this to be a valid question (Roe's[1] study on scientists) and have raised the further question of the extent to which background and other socio-economic factors are to be figured into the equation (e.g. Terman and Oden's[2] study of gifted children—high socio-economic group more successful. Difference in intelligence at this level not important).

Many questions also lie concealed in such phrases as "good performance" or "desirable behavior". To what extent, for example, do the vocations require values, motives and abilities which are part of the point of view of the social structure? What we need here is a series of good studies analyzing the kinds of outcomes in which we are interested. For example, do we relate the outcomes in which we are interested to the demands of the social structure and if so, how? Do we stress such values as skill in human relations, social sensitivity and community responsibility?

Still another next step of significance relates to the matter of the loss of potential talent. Each year, roughly 2,000,000 young Americans reach the age of 18; about 500,000 or 25% go to college. Of these 2,000,000 presumably at least 200,000 are Negroes. But only about 4,000 of the Negro group of .08 per cent annually enter interracial colleges; another 20,000 (4%) enter Negro colleges. The rest of the Negro high school graduates simply get lost in the masses of those who drop out of high school or never start. On the whole only about 60% of American youth graduate from high school. Of these about 35% enter and 21% are graduated from college. Does the answer to this loss rest in making additional funds available through scholarship programs? Would this not rather just make it easier for those already attending college? It seems to me that we need to know more about how the whole pattern of family interests is a crucial factor in determining the college plans of high school students. Also about how a low high school record may relate to other factors such as lack of financial help, lack of motivation or lack of a set of values which would push one toward a high-level career and how these factors interact. Then we would know, for example, to what extent a program of action with regard to identifying talented students needs to be directed toward parents.

---

[1] A. Roe, *The Making of a Scientist*, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1953.

[2] L. M. Terman and M. H. Oden, *The Gifted Child Grows Up*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1947.

Shifting our focus for the moment from the individual to groups, I have been intrigued by the fact that Jews, on the average, seem to be high achievers and Catholics low achievers in comparison with other groups. The record[3] shows that in the United States, as a whole, approximately 35-40% of the gainfully employed are classified in upper level occupations (i.e. clerks, managers, professionals) whereas with regard to the Jews, 80-85% of the urban Jews are employed in these same high status occupations. There has, perhaps, been an understandable reluctance to pay too much attention to the disparity in occupational achievement among various ethnic and religious groups. But it may well be that a study of group differences in achievement would help us to understand what values lead to talent development and how group value orientations play a role in this development. Easy explanations for these group differences, such as prejudice or racial inheritance are clearly inadequate. Even differences in the kind of schooling children receive, an explanation correctly used to explain why many

---

[3] McClelland, Baldwin, Bronfenbruner and Strodtbuch, *Talent and Society*, Princeton: Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1958. p. 20.

American Negroes are under-achievers, is not in all cases a sufficient explanation. It will not explain why Jews do so much better than other students attending the same schools. It will not explain why Negroes who have lived in Ontario for several generations where there is minimal prejudice, attending integrated schools, still continue as a group to be under-achievers. It may be, as Dollard[4] has suggested, that the dependent values and motives developed under slavery are still carried by Negroes, whereas the Jews may have opposite values leading to upward mobility related to a long tradition of literacy and respect for learning. One of the major weaknesses with current talent research is its very neglect of these cultural or value factors which may predispose some toward occupational achievement or toward a certain type of occupation.

Intimately related to the problem of the cultural or value factors is the problem of the whole area of non-academic determinants and non-academic types of achievement. By non-academic determinants I am thinking here of abilities which are not cognitively guided skills, such as individual motivation, values and social skills. When one deals with these the emphasis must be shifted from identifying talented persons to matching persons with certain characteristics to situations in which these characteristics will be most adaptive. We must also keep in mind that when we deal with these factors that they cannot be changed by formal instruction the way cognitively guided skills are changed. Thus when we operate within the framework of this new perspective we automatically face the question of how these more or less stable characteristics of the person or the requirements of the situation can be modified.

Much more attention, too, needs to be paid to the relationship between achievement in life and possession of skill in social perception* and status mobility.

---

[4] John Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

*(a) sensitivity to social norms of one's own group.

*(b) sensitivity to the way other people differ in their behavior, preceptions and feelings.

Studies of the non-intellectual characteristics of achievers (Jewish) *vs.* low-achievers (Italians) show that achievement seems to be associated in this instance with[5]

1. belief that man can perfect himself and control his future
2. willingness to leave one's family, if necessary, to make one's way in the world
3. early training in the family for self-reliance
4. the governing system of the family
   e.g. powerful, autocratic fathers tend to produce sons with low achievement values, while families where the mother's power is stronger produce sons more likely to have high achievement values
5. value climate of families as it derives from religion and cultural background

Finally, we need to clarify in our thinking, through good research, whether talent is a fixed attribute of a relatively few or a fairly wide-spread characteristic which can be transformed into talented performance of various sorts by the right kinds of education. If the latter is true, then our emphasis should shift from identifying talent potential to studying the process by which talent becomes actual or by which it develops. Such a focus requires above all a knowledge of theory—an understanding of what we are measuring, how it is related to the ultimate criteria of talented performance which we want to predict. Until we achieve these goals our ignorance of the process by which talented performance develops will remain an outstanding gap in current talent research.

So much for the next steps in the area of research. Let us turn now to suggestions for encouraging talented Negro youth. On the basis of my experiences in a few of our institutions, it is my belief that the single greatest deterrent to maximum achievement by talented students on our campuses is the college culture, particularly the informal student culture. By and large it is my feeling that studies of our campus communities would show that the dominant values and axes of interests of our student groups and student activities are away from an intellectual orientation. These studies would also reveal, I believe, tendencies in the formal or official culture to be too nurturant and too equivocating with regard to setting before the students a vigor of expectation along academic lines. Intensive studies of the college culture are indicated, it seems to me, to be followed by strong efforts to build a climate for learning. You will recall that in Philip Jacob's study of values of college students, those colleges which stood out from the crowd, in terms of shaping student values, were those which were characterized by a vigor of expectation and therefore had a peculiar potency.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, Fred L. Strodtbuch, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement", Chapter IV.

In addition, it seems to me that we need

1. to make our programs for superior students increasingly more visible throughout our institutions so that they will compete favorably with fraternities and sororities, athletics, etc., and will provide standards and models of excellence for all students and faculty and contribute to the substitution of an "Honors Outlook" for the "grade outlook"
2. assure that such programs will become permanent features of the curriculum, and not the pet projects of particular departments or selected faculty. In other words, such programs should be institutionalized and become a permanent part of the budget. In this way we can help to build a tradition of academic excellence
3. efforts should be made to give a particular office or person the function of securing graduate fellowships and assistantships for the superior graduates; to follow these through graduate school and to publicize their achievements on the campus
4. establish where possible an Honors center with Honors library, lounge, reading rooms and other appropriate decor
5. establish administrative flexibility so that classes

for honor students may meet two or three hours if necessary instead of 50 minutes and so that regular requirements may be waived or reduced in order to give these able students greater freedom of choice

6. establish channels through which both the superior students and their teachers either in joint or separate groups may evaluate and discuss the program

APPENDIX

RESOURCE PERSONS

John Codwell, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

J. W. Cohen, Director, Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student

R. L. Cousins, Assistant Director, Southern Education Foundation

John Hicks, Executive Director, College English Association

Benjamin Hunton, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools, Washington, D. C.

L. L. Kilgore, Director, Negro Education, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

N. D. Kurland, Associate Director, Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student

Roger P. McCutcheon, Consultant, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

Daniel Schreiber, Coordinator, Higher Horizons Program, New York City

Bruce Shertzer, Associate Director, Project on Guidance and Motivation of Superior and Talented Students, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Cecil Taylor, Dean, College of the Arts and Sciences, Louisiana State University

COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

A. A. Abraham, Director, Test Service Bureau, Florida A. & M. University

William A. Banner, Coordinator of Honors Program, Howard University

Horace Mann Bond, Dean, Atlanta University

Sidney S. Boose, Department of Education, Grambling College

Ruth Bradford, Department of Education, Grambling College

B. R. Brazeal, Dean, Morehouse College

E. W. Browne, Registrar, Bluefield State College

Oscar J. Chapman, Dean of Instruction, Lincoln University, Missouri

Theodore S. Currier, Chairman, Department of History, Fisk University

Willie C. Davis, Department of English, Clark College

John Hope Franklin, Chairman, Department of History, Brooklyn College

Lillian Harvey, Dean, School of Nursing, Tuskegee Institute

Robert Harvey, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Knoxville College

Carl M. Hill, Dean of Faculty, Tennessee A. & I. State University

John M. Howard, Arkansas A. M. & N. College

Esther M. Jackson, Division of Humanities, Tuskegee Institute

Lewis A. Jackson, Dean, Central State College

Clifton H. Johnson, Lemoyne College

Earl M. Lewis, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Prairie View A. & M. College

George McKenna, Xavier University, New Orleans

Herbert A. Marshall, Administrative Assistant, Virginia State College

J. E. Marshall, Director, Freshman Studies, Arkansas A. M. & N. College

Malvin E. Moore, Dean, Arkansas A. M. & N. College

Nettie P. Parler, Head, Department of English, South Carolina State College

Joseph A. Payne, Dean of Students, Tennessee A. & I. State University

Huel D. Perkins, Department of Music, Southern University

Joseph A. Pierce, Dean, Graduate School, Texas Southern University

G. T. Ridgel, Dean, Wiley College

William Robinson, Director, Division of Education, Hampton Institute

Lynette Saine, Director, Reading Clinic, Atlanta University

A. J. Scavella, Division of Basic Studies, Tuskegee Institute

Stanley H. Smith, Division of Social Science, Tuskegee Institute

Alexander E. Strawn, Dean of Students, Texas College

Vivian J. Tellis, Department of English, Southern University

Henry Thomas, Director of Admissions, Dillard University

Oscar L. Thompson, Huston-Tillotson College

C. V. Troup, Fort Valley State College

Albert N. Whiting, Dean, Morgan State College

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Elton C. Harrison, Chairman

Mrs. Mattie Craig, Conference Secretary

R. G. Higgins
V. R. Goines
M. L. Harvey
Blyden Jackson
G. L. Netterville
L. H. Newsom
Vivian J. Tellis

CONFERENCE ADVISORS

Joseph W. Cohen, Director, Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student

Norman D. Kurland, Associate Director, Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student

Felton G. Clark, President, Southern University